

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCXCIV.

SEPTEMBER, 1889.

THE ELIXIR OF LIFE.

BY WILLIAM A. HAMMOND, SURGEON-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED.

THE search for elixirs of life is only one phase of that insatiable desire to investigate the infinite which has characterized the human species since it first made its appearance on the earth. The philosopher's stone, the fountain of youth, the squaring of the circle, perpetual motion, are other forms to which mankind have at different periods of the world's history given much time and thought. Some of these are, in the very nature of things, impossibilities, and not long ago the French Academy refused to receive any communications from those who pretended that they had discovered perpetual motion. But others are by no means impossibilities, and those who declare that they are have no clear idea of the matter at issue. The philosopher's stone, for instance, or something analogous thereto, which a few hundred years ago was the object of much scientific research, is probably by no means beyond the realm of realization. By the use of this agent it was supposed that the baser metals could be transmuted into gold. Subsequently, when science had made considerable progress, such a pretension was regarded as absolutely absurd, but recent advances in chemistry and physics have shown

us that many substances which were formerly supposed to be very different, one from another, are now known to be identical in every respect, except, perhaps, in their external forms; every year sees the list of so-called elementary substances decreased instead of increased in number, and there is strong reason for believing that there is, after all, but one form of matter which makes itself manifest to us under different aspects. He is an ignoramus who asserts that it is *impossible* that lead and gold can be identical. All that he can truthfully say is that they appear to us to be very different from each other, and that science has not yet demonstrated that they are the same substance under different forms. The same ignoramus, with little less sciolism, would just as emphatically declare that two substances as unlike each other in all obvious characteristics as a diamond of the first water and a piece of common charcoal are as distinct from each other as night from day.

The fact is that, outside of the domains of mathematics and physics, there are no impossibilities in nature. For instance, two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time, and two and two added together can never, under any circumstances, be any other number than four; but many things which are ordinarily regarded as impossible, simply because they have not yet been proved, may to-morrow become established facts. The sagacious critic reserves his opinion relative to unfamiliar subjects and those which are apparently at variance with his idea of the laws of nature; but he knows how little he really knows, and therefore waits, ready to believe or disbelieve, in accordance with further developments and new facts.

Now, there is nothing inherently impossible in a so-called "elixir of life"—that is, in a substance that, when taken into the system, may so arrest the deteriorating influences of old age as to prolong life and to render existence more tolerable. Neither is there anything unworthy in medical science in the search for such an agent. There are persons, and they seem to be especially numerous in the profession of medicine, who, never having made an original observation themselves, or performed an experiment outside the grubbing routine of their daily drudgery, cry "quackery," and "humbug," and "fraud" at everything new that is brought to their attention. It is something of which they have never previously heard, and which they have never

investigated, and which, therefore, must be an impossibility. They belong to the same class as those who persecuted Harvey when he discovered the circulation of the blood. His detractors expelled him from the medical societies to which he belonged, refused to consult with him, and denounced him as an impostor. Had it not been for the open countenance of the King, they would probably have succeeded in burying Harvey and the circulation of the blood in a common grave. Many of us know how, even in our own time, the discoverer of anæsthesia was stigmatized as an ignoramus and a quack.

It is only necessary for a physician anxious to enlarge the boundaries of his science to announce some discovery of the virtues of a drug, to be pounced upon by these narrow-minded donkeys with ridicule and abuse. In their eyes all innovation is quackery. To hold views different from theirs in regard, for instance, to the functions of an organ of the body or the power of a remedy is an immorality not less in heinousness than picking a pocket or committing a burglary. The experiments are necessarily fictitious, the cases are manufactured for the occasion, and the would-be discoverer should be placed beyond the pale of association with the body of his profession. Fortunately in this age of the world there is a power in public opinion which keeps malicious sloths and dullards with their noses to the grindstone. They never rise to the level of respectable mediocrity in their profession, and the truth prevails in spite of their impotent rage and pitiable ignorance.

But while there is no impossibility in an "elixir of life," it is very certain that until now all the attempts that have been made to discover such an agent have resulted in disappointment, and this not so much from anything inherently improbable in such investigations as in the manner in which they were conducted. Up to the present time the subject has not engaged the attention of the medical profession for several centuries. One of the latest works on the subject is that of Fra Donato D'Eremita, published in Naples in 1624, and it must be confessed that, from the standpoint of the science of the present day, it is rather a ridiculous production. It contains a great many engravings of instruments and apparatus of a complicated character for the attainment of ends that might just as readily have been reached by much simpler means. For instance, there is a cumbersome arrange-

ment for effecting distillation by the agency of the sun; the rays being received upon a mirror and thence transmitted to a retort. There is another, consisting of an alembic with a series of receivers one above the other, the lower one receiving the grosser products of the distillation, while the higher catches those that are more refined and ethereal. The substances of which his "elixir" was made were vegetable, animal, and mineral, to the number of nearly a hundred. Among them were valerian, cassia, cinnamon, mace, aloes, artemesia, honey, vipers, musk, asphalt, bezoar stones, coral, pearls, sapphires, emeralds, agate, gold, silver, topaz, and others "too numerous to mention." It was regarded as a specific in more than three hundred different diseases, among them being gout, apoplexy, loss of sight, cancer, carbuncle, catarrh, dysentery, epilepsy, herpes, paralysis, tabes, and various mental affections.

The difficulty with Fra Donato is that the virtues of his "elixir" are entirely hypothetical. Experiment and fact are altogether foreign to his investigations. He assumes that the various agents entering into his compositions possess certain properties, and from this assumption he infers, with a degree of positiveness equal to that of the obstructors of scientific research to whom I have referred, that it must necessarily be possessed of curative powers far in excess of those belonging to any other known remedy. And yet, after all, there is nothing *impossible* in the claims of Fra Donato. He simply omitted the very necessary preliminary of proving that his pretensions were based upon facts, and it would take a great many facts to establish his "elixir" as a therapeutical agent or a prolonger of life.

Now, let us see how a searcher for an "elixir of life" would go to work in our own time.

There are two ways by which such an agent could be discovered, if in reality such an agent exists.

First—By empiricism.

Second—By investigation and research.

It is seldom the case that new remedies for diseases are discovered by any other means than by empiricism—that is, unreasoning experiment. A physician in search of a remedy for a disease with which he is unfamiliar, experiments with various substances which he imagines may be of service in his treatment. Sometimes more by accident than by any other cause he makes a

surprising discovery. This was the case with ether, the anæsthetic properties of which there was no reason to suspect from any knowledge of its properties we formerly possessed. The discovery of the virtues of Peruvian bark and its alkaloids in the treatment of malarial affections was also a matter of pure empiricism. The anæsthetic properties of cocaine could not possibly have been deduced from a knowledge of its chemical composition or of its action upon the organism when taken into the system. The like is true of mercury, the bromides, the iodides, and many other remedies, without which at the present day it would be impossible to practise medicine successfully. The "elixirs of life" compounded by Paracelsus, Roger Bacon, and others, consisted of substances chosen mainly by caprice or from some fancied analogy with the principle of life, the powers of which upon the human system were wholly unknown.

The object of true science is, of course, to lessen the domain of empiricism, while increasing that of rational therapeutics; but, at the same time, it must be borne in mind that the first object of the physician is to abolish suffering and to save life, and that for the accomplishment of these ends he is justified in using any means that, with or without reason, he thinks may be of service. Take, for instance, such diseases as hydrophobia and tetanus, from the first-named of which not a single case of authentic recovery is on record, and from the second of which the cures are almost infinitesimal in number. To experiment in the treatment of either of these diseases is a physician's bounden duty, for there is no known remedy for either of them. Of course, the scientific physician experiments in a more rational way than does the sciolist. His knowledge of anatomy, physiology, pathology, and of the general effects of medicines, gives him a great advantage over the ignoramus, and, if his patients recover, he is careful how he ascribes the result to his treatment rather than to the inherent forces of nature residing in the patient. But it has often happened that the ignoramus has hit upon a remedy for a hitherto unmanageable disease, when science, with everything in its favor, has ignominiously failed.

Again, a physician carefully studies the nature of the disease in regard to which he sets out to obtain a cure. He observes its course as it affects the lower animals; he makes dissections and brings all his knowledge of chemistry and microscopy to bear

upon the point at issue. He makes his experiments in the first place in his laboratory with medicines the actions of which are in a measure known to him, and which he has, therefore, reason to suppose he may find to be of value. Thus we will imagine a patient to be suffering from congestion of the spinal cord. We want a remedy that will lessen that congestion by constringing the blood-vessels. It has long been known that ergot has the power of contracting the organic muscular fibres of the uterus. The muscular fibres of the blood-vessels are of the kind called organic, and differ from the muscular tissue of the arms or legs, for instance, in the fact that they are not under the control of the will, and that, unlike these latter, they are not marked with transverse striæ. There is, therefore, some reason to suppose that ergot might contract the blood-vessels, and hence be of service in the treatment of spinal congestion.

But the evidence is not yet quite complete, for the organic muscular fibres of the uterus may be one thing and those of the blood-vessels another, in some way unknown to us, although they look precisely alike when examined with a microscope. Now, we take a frog, examine the web of his foot with a microscope, and then put a little ergot into his stomach, and in a short time we see the blood-vessels of the part contract and in some cases become so small as not to admit of the passage of the blood corpuscles. This is additional evidence, but there is still more to be had. We expose the spinal cord in a dog and then dose it with ergot. We see that a like result takes place as in the frog, for under its influence the blood-vessels of the part become smaller. We repeat these experiments many times, and then we are justified in saying that ergot contracts the blood-vessels of the spinal cord. Still we are not yet sure that its action in a diseased cord will be similar to that in a healthy cord. We give it to a patient who is suffering from congestion of the spinal cord and he recovers; and yet we are not sure, for the result may have been due to some other agent of which we have no certain knowledge. We repeat the experiment again and again. Sometimes our patients are cured, and again we fail. The failures may be due to the fact that all people are not alike, and that the system of one absorbs the medicine while that of others does not; that the disease may have advanced so far as to be beyond the reach of any remedy, or that we have made a mistake in our diagnosis

and have had to deal with some other disease than spinal congestion. So that, after all, the most that we can say in regard to the matter is that ergot is beneficial in some cases of spinal congestion.

Within a few weeks intelligence has been received in this country that Dr. Brown-Séquard, of Paris, certainly the most eminent living physiologist, especially so far as the nervous system is concerned, has been experimenting with the expressed juice of certain glands of the body with a view to discovering its effects when taken into the human system. The newspapers (not Dr. Brown-Séquard nor any other authority, so far as I know) have designated this juice the "Elixir of Life." As a result of his investigations he announced in an address delivered before the Société de Biologie, of which he is president, that, after a dozen or more injections under the skin of his own body of the juice from these glands taken from guinea-pigs and rabbits, he experienced a change that might almost be regarded as a rejuvenation. Dr. Brown-Séquard is seventy-two years of age, and he says he felt as though a weight of twenty years had been lifted from his life. He refers to other experiments performed upon the lower animals, all apparently leading to similar results. In addition, Dr. Variot relates the details of three cases of old persons in which, under like treatment, like effects to those obtained by Dr. Brown-Séquard were produced.

The first information received in this country of Dr. Brown-Séquard's researches was through a telegram to a New York newspaper, conveying such imperfect details, however, that the writer was disposed to question either the authenticity of the report or Dr. Brown-Séquard's mental equilibrium. It was apparently stated that various glands of the body were used in his experiments, and that Dr. Brown-Séquard had suddenly become a very much younger man than he had been. Further information, however, showed the exact nature of his experiments and of the claims which he had set up in their behalf. The writer therefore determined to examine into the matter for himself, and as the result of his investigation he is enabled to give, in such general terms as are suitable for a secular journal like THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, a confirmation of Dr. Brown-Séquard's statements, so far as his researches have extended. And not only this, but he has apparently shown that muscular

rheumatism of long standing has been entirely relieved after a single injection of the juice in question. He has been careful to state, and he still so declares, that all the experiments performed up to this time are not sufficient to establish the claims of this glandular juice as an alleviator of old age or a curer of any disease whatever. The whole matter is yet in its experimental stage, and it will there remain until the subject has been examined into by many physicians under different circumstances, and a general coincidence of opinion obtained. A large part of the newspaper press of the country, with the sensational head-lines which they put to every communication on the subject, have done everything to give that exaggerated idea of Dr. Brown-Séquard's investigations which they now affect to deplore.

Now, Dr. Brown-Séquard did not go blindly to work with his experiments, for every intelligent physician knows the relation which exists between the glands in question and the mental and physical condition of the animal to which they belong. There is much *à-priori* reasoning to support the conclusions at which he has arrived. They are not based upon empiricism, but are rational investigations carried out with intelligence. Whether or not he has made any permanent addition to our means of assuaging the infirmities of old age or of curing disease, time alone can show. But those physicians who denounce honest investigation in this or any other direction are unworthy of the profession to which they belong, and should be relegated to some limbo where they can enjoy their self-satisfaction without coming in contact with their more energetic brethren.

WILLIAM A. HAMMOND.

COMMON-SENSE AND CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM.

BY GENERAL JOHN POPE.

PERHAPS there has been no subject more discussed in this country during the past ten years than the question of a re-organization of our civil service. Unfortunately, however, it has been treated, as most discussions on kindred topics have been treated by us, with a constant squinting to the practice of other governments and an apparently uncontrollable tendency to imitate some foreign system which seems to have worked favorable results in other countries. Yet there is nothing more certain than the fact that a system of civil service, like a system of government, which would be suited to a people and to political conditions so different from our own would be wholly unsuited to us. Indeed, the fact that any such system worked well in France or Germany or England would not only *not* be presumptive evidence that it would suit us, but actual proof that it would not.

The spirit of the people, their conditions of life and habits of thought, their experience of government, the absence, as in no other country, of all class distinctions, and the repugnance to such distinctions, must all be considered in determining on any organization, civil or military, for the service of the people of this country. Of course, there are certain general principles which must underlie all organizations among men; but the number of systems and the infinite variations among them, based upon these accepted foundations, can only be equalled by the varied religious creeds of the Christian world, which all rest for their authority upon one book.

Nor can there be a greater and more misleading fallacy than the oft-repeated saying, as if it were an axiom not to be gainsaid, that "the business of the government should be conducted on business methods."

There could hardly be found in the world organizations whose objects are further apart or in more direct moral conflict than the government of the United States and the great corporations or private combinations for making money. The practices of these last-named associations are what are known as "business methods." It is wholly unnecessary to point out in detail the differences in the *personnel* of these organizations, in the manner of selecting and appointing their officers, in their duties and their relation to their employers (who in the case of the government are the people), and, indeed, a thousand others that might be mentioned. A moment's thought will make it plain that to use the methods of one to carry on the business of the other would be a piece of folly of which the business man would never be guilty.

In everything relating to these matters we appear still to hark back to the monkey condition of imitation. If England is successful in its civil-service methods, the idea of our reformers is to adopt English methods at once. If Germany, with its military organization, wins a campaign this year, we are urged by our military reformers to adopt the German military system immediately, to be changed for the French, if France should by chance be successful next year. These recommendations are made with the most dogmatic emphasis, and without the smallest consideration of the wide differences between the people to be operated on and the conditions under which they live. It does not appear to have occurred to our reformers that such matters should be thought of as essential elements in any plans for reform, and that no system in this country can work well unless fully grounded on these popular traits, either natural or acquired as the outcome of our institutions. I might illustrate this proposition by an examination of our army system, which is based on these foreign models, and is and always will be unsatisfactory and unpopular. It is a foreign body injected into our body politic, and, like a foreign substance introduced into the system, is sure to irritate, if it do not produce disease.

In considering, therefore, a system of civil service to be adopted by the government, careful study must be given to the characteristics of our people, which make us quite a different race from any of the civilized peoples of Europe, however great may be our outward resemblance.

In the first place, our theory is that this is a government of the people ; that all public officers, from the President down to the smallest tide-waiter, are their agents and servants ; that the people are the sovereign, and bound to do a sovereign's duty in looking to the welfare of the country and selecting proper persons to represent them in the counsels of the nation. So strongly do we hold this theory of government, and so deeply has it entered into our life, that we have given the same right to vote, and to take part in governing the country, to almost every inhabitant, from the centenarian to the child in arms, and have thrust the ballot into the hands of every immigrant who lands in New York before he has ceased to curse the authorities and arrangements at Castle Garden.

One of the most serious complaints to-day is that so many of our citizens fail to take any other part in performing the duties of citizenship, and it is justly maintained that, being sovereigns, all good citizens are bound to do the duty of sovereigns. To base a system of civil service upon the proposition that no office-holder shall take any part in the political movements of the people, except merely to vote, is repugnant to our whole idea of government. In the midst of this dissatisfaction that so many people neglect the duties of citizenship, it naturally creates surprise that an order should be issued or a law enacted practically to disfranchise every office-holder in the country by depriving him of half his rights and duties as a citizen merely because he has been chosen for a public trust. One hundred thousand citizens of the United States, belonging, presumably, to the most intelligent and respectable classes of the community, are thus to be deprived of all participation in public affairs except what is covered by a mere vote. Instead of public office being an honor, it has become, or will become, under such a system, a reproach to the incumbent. Surely it cannot be intended that public offices in this country shall be thus rated. It is precisely the advice and influence of such members of a community as those who hold public office which are needed to aid the general voters of the locality in arriving at suitable opinions and action as to questions of public policy upon which the country is called to pronounce a decision. It is a far greater injury to the general public to deprive them of the counsel and active aid of one of their most respected citizens than any possible

harm which could come to the mere perfunctory duties of his office.

I think it may be safely said that the people of this country will not give their sanction to either of two features which are essential parts of the system of civil service we are now attempting to put in operation. First, they will not consent that a large number of presumably intelligent and respectable men shall be practically disfranchised to the extent of being prevented from active interest in public affairs; and, secondly, that they will never degrade the public offices of the country by making it more or less a reproach to accept one. In short, they will not consent to saddle this country for all time with a hundred thousand political eunuchs, who hold the offices of trust, but are for that reason incapacitated for the duties of good citizens.

There are other considerations which would seem to militate against the experiments we are making. One of the principal is the fact that Administrations in this country go into office on some well-defined policies, which have been submitted to the people of the country, thoroughly discussed before them, and adopted. The Administration placed in power in this manner is simply the agent of the people to carry out these policies, and this agent is bound to use lawfully, but vigorously, the means that the principal has placed in his hand to make them successful. That he should receive no help in this duty from the hundred thousand other agents having, in their degree, the same responsibility to the people would appear strange and deplorable; but that the chief agents should themselves forbid these subordinates to help them is amazing. Not only is it demanded of the new Administration by this system that it shall decline the help of its appointees, but it is also required to keep in offices of trust and influence numbers of persons who oppose the policies which the people have commanded to be carried out, and who most assuredly used their best efforts to defeat them at the polls. Thus would the government leave its opponents, weapon in hand, to resist its purposes, or replace them by members of its own faith, after first disarming and partially dishonoring them. To say nothing of the un wisdom of such a policy, it is an injustice to the people of the country, who are entitled to the active help of its servants to bring its measures to a successful issue. The attempt to restrict

the rights of citizenship of any class of respectable persons in this country must fail, in the nature of things; and it is quite sure that no law or order can ever prevent the office-holder in the United States from doing his full work as a factor in the elections. I think it will be admitted that our experience so far has confirmed this statement. It is a well-established axiom that it is bad policy to make a law or issue an order which cannot be enforced, and certainly no law, such as I understand this order to be, can be enforced in this country unless a considerable majority of the community supports it. It certainly cannot be truthfully stated that this order about office-holders has ever been thus supported. Indeed, it is open to direct inference that the President himself recognizes this condition.

I think it may be safely said that government in the United States will continue to be carried on by political parties, and that the public offices will be held by the adherents of the party in power. This I believe to be not only certain, but right and wise. I base this belief upon what I consider an undeniable proposition, which is this: every Administration in this country goes into power to execute some policy which the people have determined on, and the executive department of the government, its agent, is bound to use all the means placed at its command, within the law, to make this policy successful. If the executive officers fail to do this, from highest to lowest, they fall short of the duty they owe to their employers. For the people of the country to decide upon a policy to be pursued, and then consent that all the public offices be held by men seeking to bring that policy to grief, is almost as absurd as to replace these enemies by friends who are forbidden to help.

I by no means intend to assail the reform of the civil service. I only purpose to present certain objections to the system we are trying to put in force, which seem to me to militate against any prospect that it will be successful. In the same spirit I venture to make some suggestions as to the requirements of a system which shall conform more nearly to the feelings and habits of our people, and be, therefore, more willingly supported. Such a system must allow the widest latitude of personal and political action to the incumbents of public office, great and small, and must, at the same time, make the responsibility for their appointment direct and unavoidable, and the remedy of quick and easy application.

In no way that I know of can this be accomplished more easily and thoroughly than by enforcing our theory of local self-government in the appointment of public officers, as in so many other matters of importance to the country.

No doubt the President is the appointing power, and is, in theory at least, responsible for the conduct of his appointees ; but the President is far away from many of the communities which may be cursed with inefficient or corrupt public officials, and the criminals may well say, as the Campbells of old were wont to say to their enemies, " It is a far cry to Loch Aw." The President holds his office for a comparatively long period, and performs his duties in a distant city. The influence of any single community weighed little in securing his election to office, and can do even less to benefit or injure his administration.

His responsibility for an inefficient or corrupt office-holder is, therefore, not only very remote, but it is well-nigh impossible to appeal to him with the hope that the appeal will ever be considered. In this strait the people are driven to their Member of Congress, who, having probably been ignored in the appointment of the obnoxious official, is, naturally, not on such terms with the President that his interposition would avail much. Neither the President nor the Cabinet official in whose department the objectionable official serves has, of course, much interest in the community concerned, nor in the matter which disturbs it, so that it is not too much to say that the hope of correcting such an evil as inefficiency or bad conduct on the part of an official of the General Government, in any except very prominent localities and extreme cases, by an appeal to Washington, is not encouraging. To make this responsibility more direct, and to assume that the remedy can be immediately applied by the community concerned, should be the first object in considering a system for appointments to public office, and such a system must pay proper respect to the theory of local self-government, which is an integral part of our institutions, and hardly less valued than the most important clauses of the Constitution. It is not entirely sound to say that the politicians brought about that condition of the civil service which we are seeking to reform. There is an instinct among the people of this country concerning all great public questions which is the real cause of every situation in which public business or methods are at any time found.

There is no theory to which we hold more strongly than the distribution to many hands of the great powers of government, and this sentiment has led us to contemplate with extreme distaste any attempt to concentrate these powers in fewer hands than a strict construction of the Constitution clearly warrants. The patronage of the government, which to-day includes the appointment of nearly a hundred thousand civil officers, is an enormous power for good or for evil. It is not easy to compute what would be the influence that could be wielded by this great army of active and intelligent men, each occupying an official position of greater or less power, and each using it for the interest of one and the same man. It involves a danger which the people instinctively feel, and on this feeling the politicians base their demand for some consideration in the appointments to public office. It cannot be denied that this great power to appoint the public officers, if corruptly used or applied to selfish ends, threatens serious damage to our institutions, which will grow greater as we increase in population and wealth. We should treat this great power as we would treat a public enemy. We should divide and distribute it among as many hands as efficiency of service would justify, and create so many and such varied interests within its exercise that it cannot be wielded *en masse* and no part of it can be used for the benefit of any of the great officials of the government. It is certainly wise to treat every public man in this country, especially so high a functionary as the President, as equally subject to temptation as ourselves, and liable to yield in proportion to the amount of inducement. If any President is pure and blameless in these matters, he certainly is a much better man than the majority of his fellow-citizens and sinners. In point of fact, no President is much better or worse than the average of his countrymen. It is certainly wisdom, therefore, to expose him to no more temptation than the necessities of his position require. It is usual to say that the President is responsible for the performance of the public business, and should, therefore, have the uncontrolled power of appointing the agents to do it; but he is not responsible in any such sense or to any such degree as is implied in that statement. A general commanding an army in battle is responsible for its being well or ill managed, but no one pretends to assert that he should have the right to appoint the officers under his command. He is responsible, just as the President is responsible, only for his

own acts and his good faith in doing them. It is only to a very limited extent and in a remote degree that the President can be said to be responsible for the bad conduct of his appointees—a responsibility which has never greatly affected his political standing or future career.

Briefly, then, it would appear to me that so great a power as that of appointing a hundred thousand office-holders, distributed over the whole country, and dependent on the will of one man or three or four men for their positions, is too menacing to the well-being of the country to be entirely confided to a President and his Cabinet. It is, in my opinion, due to this instinctive feeling of the people—and no doubt a sound feeling—that the practice grew up (and for a long time was a sort of tacit understanding) of allowing members of Congress to indicate, to a considerable degree, most of the Federal officers appointed in their respective districts. The remote responsibility of the President for the faithful performance of their duties by these widely-scattered officials thus became a direct responsibility upon the members of Congress who nominated them. The people concerned are very sure to demand that the duties of the public officers in their midst be faithfully performed. Every man in the community feels in his own person any neglect of a public officer to do his duty, and the communities themselves are the principal sufferers from inefficient service of such officers. Regardless of politics, they will insist on good administration when their own interest or convenience is concerned. It is not difficult to see how strong a control in this matter the people could exercise under such a condition, and how little under the system we are now experimenting with. The remedy and the punishment for bad appointments to office can thus be applied directly to the party responsible for such appointments by the community which suffers from them.

It is not to be questioned that the enormous patronage of Administrations in this country is the most fruitful source of public corruption. Whether it is wiser to concentrate this great power, with all its incentives to misuse, in the hands of two or three or a dozen men in office in Washington city, and thus poison the very sources of administration, or to distribute it widely over the country, where its power to produce any serious danger will be lost by attenuation, is a question of the least importance. And

in this connection it may be pertinently asked, Who shall be consulted and whose recommendation shall carry most weight in appointments to public office? The natural reply to this question would be that, of course, the Representative in Congress from the locality concerned is the proper person. By no possibility can the President possess such extensive personal knowledge of communities and men all over this country that he himself can select appointees to office intelligently. He must consult some one; and who would be the most likely person to give him the information he needs, if it be not the Representative in Congress from the district where appointments are to be made? Is it not rather a reflection upon the people that the President should neglect or ignore the opinions and recommendations of the men they send to Washington to represent them?

There are certain great offices which the President is empowered under the Constitution to fill by his own appointment and with the consent of the Senate. There are other offices, by far the most numerous, the creation of which and the appointments to which are regulated by an act of Congress. Why not, then, make the experiment of distributing this great power of appointment among the members of Congress, to the extent, at least, of having it clearly understood that *in the first instance*, except in special cases, the Federal offices in the country shall be filled by persons recommended by the member of Congress from the district concerned? If the appointee prove unfit,—and that fact will soon become known,—the member of Congress who designated him will lose his influence with the Administration and his political standing at home. The partial practice of something like this idea in the past has not been a fair trial of it, because it was not directly known that appointments were made as a rule on the recommendation of members of Congress, and it was always possible for them to say of a bad office-holder that they had not been consulted or their advice acted on. I make this merely as a suggestion, with the belief that we cannot make our condition much worse, and that we shall at least have distributed to many more hands the exercise of a power which is potent for evil in the inverse ratio of the number of people who possess it. This distribution of power, which it is perfectly within the province of Congress to make, is certainly in the direct line of our demo-

cratic theory of local self-government. It certainly would make more direct, and easier of remedy, the responsibility for bad appointments.

The tenure of office in the civil service seems to be quite as troublesome a question as the matter of appointments to office, and has, perhaps, been as much discussed. There is, no doubt, a great deal that can be said on both or on all sides of this question; but it would seem wise to begin the consideration of it by classifying the office-holders not so much according to the nature of their duties as according to the localities and the environment in which they serve. To illustrate the suggestion I intend to make, a classification of these employees into those who serve in the District of Columbia and those who serve in their States will, perhaps, be sufficient.

The duties of the officials serving in the District of Columbia may be stated generally as supervisory, the clerical force being merely employed in studying and recording details incidental to this object. These officials practically remove from their own States, abandon their former business and home, and take up their temporary residence, at least, in Washington. Indeed, it may be said to be their permanent home, since the cases are rare in which an office-holder in Washington ever leaves that city so long as he can remain and solicit reappointment. Their duties and associations are wholly confined to that locality, and they have no power to use political influence or take part in political movements, except a mere nominal claim that they have their homes in the State whence they were appointed—a remote claim, and one in general contradicted by the facts. These minor officials in Washington, having only the routine business of their offices to perform, the same under all Administrations,—and being entirely without any field for political work, should, in my opinion, have a tenure of office based on good behavior and the efficient discharge of duty, and should not be displaced by any change of Administration, except for the causes indicated.

They are, in fact (and should be so recognized), persons without political power or influence, and placed beyond the reach of any use for political objects. They should be required to give up their residence in the States whence appointed, so long as they hold office in Washington; and whilst there they should possess all the rights, personal and political, enjoyed by the people of

the District of Columbia, and no other. This tenure of office would also free Washington from a large part of the army of importunate and unhappy people who now beset every person of standing and influence with applications for office, and would free the incumbent of office from the continual dread of removal, which now impairs his value and embitters his life. In this manner they would become the servants of whatever Administration might be in power for the performance of duty in the office of the great executive departments, and offer no temptation to enterprising candidates for office.

The position of officials who serve elsewhere than in the District of Columbia is altogether different. They continue to reside in the localities for whose service they are appointed; they carry on, in many cases, their own business, in addition to that of the government; they maintain their status, social, business, and political, in the communities where they live. They should perform the duties and exercise the political privileges enjoyed by every other citizen. In short, their relations to people and transactions in the localities where they reside are in no respect changed except so far as certain public duties which they perform are concerned. These duties and their efficient discharge are of direct personal concern to every member of the community. This community will soonest know and most loudly protest against bad conduct and bad administration of public officers in its midst. The strict performance of the public business is all that the government can properly exact from its servants. That secured, the office-holder should be as free as any other citizen to take whatever part he pleases in public affairs. Any attempt to deprive him of this right will be of doubtful good and very doubtful success.

The tenure of office of such officials should, in the nature of things, be a different matter from that of the office-holder at the seat of government. The public officers scattered all over this broad country, and distributed to the obscurest and remotest localities, and exercising, as they certainly will, all their influence in favor of the policies of the political party to which they belong, must be in harmony with the party to which the government has been for the time committed. Otherwise an Administration would itself actually keep on foot a large and well-posted force to defeat the successful execution of the very policies on which it went into

office. In the nature of political parties in this country, such a condition of things can never be. Whilst the saying that "to the victors belong the spoils" has been made odious in this country, the expression itself, as it is interpreted, is an unfair and misleading statement of a fact which exists, and perhaps ought to exist. It does not mean actually that to the successful party at the polls belongs the plunder of the people; but it no doubt does mean that the office-holders shall sustain the Administration in executing the policies which the people have placed that Administration in power to carry out. That the public officials will take part in the elections is pretty sure, whether in compliance with or against orders, and an Executive is compelled to have either friends or enemies in the public offices. It does not seem to me doubtful what will be the result of such a situation. I repeat the belief that the public business confided to these officials will not be materially affected by their active participation in political movements, and that the people of the communities in which their duties are done will assuredly, irrespective of party, compel them to be faithfully performed.

I think, then, that with our form of government, and the wide liberty and practically unlimited rights of its citizens in this country, which we cannot abridge, it would, perhaps, serve the purpose of civil-service reform for the present if it should be decided that the office-holders in Washington be appointed by the President and the chiefs of the great executive departments of the government, and that their tenure of office should be during good behavior and the faithful performance of their duties. This rule can be enforced without invading the rights or privileges of the citizen, since such a tenure of office would require that the appointee change his residence to the District of Columbia, where for him there would be no field for political action which could affect anything more important than the local affairs of the District. Being under the immediate supervision of the chief executive officers of the government, the responsibility for their appointment and their conduct in office would be directly and unavoidably fixed. This responsibility, and the power to exact the penalty of it promptly, should be the basis of the whole system of appointment to offices, and it is in this view that I make the foregoing and following suggestions.

I propose that, in the first instance, the officers whose ser-

vice is to be in the States whence appointed shall receive their appointments on the recommendation of the Senator or the Representative in Congress from their district, except in special cases and for special reasons. With the power to remove these officials at any time, the President would possess all the authority to enforce faithful performance of duty that he would have under any system, whilst the community would, in like manner, be able to deal with its member of Congress, who would be responsible for the appointments, and who would thus be liable to lose influence alike with the Administration and with his constituents.

Abstract theories and sentimental views of public policy are often interesting and occasionally useful; but we are a practical people, and whilst recognizing the abstract beauty and wisdom of such theories, we base our action largely upon the environment in which we are placed, and the circumstances which surround us. While perfect good should be held in view, we know that we can make only an approximation to it, and in considering the present question and its answer we are subject to the conditions which our form of government and the feelings and habits of our people impose upon us. It is only by careful study and consideration of these conditions that we may effect any organization of the civil service which will secure efficiency and prove acceptable to the public feeling.

JNO. POPE.

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF THE CIVIL WAR.

IV.

BY GENERAL VISCOUNT WOLSELEY, K. P., ADJUTANT-GENERAL
OF THE BRITISH ARMY.

I WISH to remind the reader of these articles on the Civil War that they deal only with the information supplied by *The Century* magazine's history of that struggle. The story there told so graphically is treated from the military student's and the military critic's point of view, and it is earnestly trusted that no one may be offended with anything contained in these articles. Many may differ from the conclusions arrived at, and the views expressed may be often or always mistaken; but they are, at least, the honest opinions of one who has the most sincere admiration for the combatants on both sides, and for the many great soldiers and statesmen who then directed the destinies of the United States of America.

The readers of these *Century* magazine papers owe a debt of gratitude to the editors for the pains with which they have collected the various documents. The references to the parts of other papers on the same subject, and to the official publications of the losses and numbers of combatants on both sides, are very useful. But there is one respect in which I would venture to suggest improvement, if any future edition should afford an opportunity. It seems ungracious, where we have been supplied with such a large and costly number of maps, plans, and pictures, to find fault with this aspect of the series. Unfortunately, however, there is one thing needful for a military reader which has not been adequately provided. The text does not seem to have been carefully read by any editor who is in the habit of following, upon the corresponding maps, the movements described. The consequence is, it frequently happens that names of places are men-

tioned in the text which do not appear in the maps. It is not too much to say that for all purposes of intelligent military study, if the reader had to depend solely on these maps, there is much in the text which might almost as well be omitted. Even when, after much search, the place named is discovered in some map or other, the map in which it is found is often not that which has been prepared to elucidate that part of the narrative. One does not, consequently, get the place shown in relation to other localities described. From time to time references are given to particular maps, but these references are not sufficiently frequent. The references required to other portions of the text, in support of evidence adduced, are good and ample, and it is much to be regretted that similar care has not been taken to guide the reader to the map required to elucidate the text upon all occasions.

The third volume covers a series of the most deeply interesting operations of the war. These are, in the East, Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, and Gettysburg; in the West, Perryville, Vicksburg, Port Hudson, Chickamauga, Chattanooga, and Knoxville; to which I may add, for the purposes of this article, the papers at the end of Volume II. on the Mexican campaign and the battles of Iuka and Corinth. To these battles no reference was made in my article in last month's *NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW*, because they are closely connected with the general sequence of events in the West, which are recorded in this third volume.

For many reasons the three great battles in the East will be considered first.

General Longstreet has made certain comments upon the whole series of papers on those events, which serve as a convenient basis for a discussion of the interesting questions which rise out of them. He himself had a brilliant share in the victory at Fredericksburg. He was absent from Chancellorsville, but he tells us that on his return to the army, prior to the invasion of Pennsylvania, he propounded certain views and principles to General Lee with regard to the general conduct of future operations. I have already quoted Jackson's views as to what he considered to be the guiding principles of war. It is worth while to compare them with those that are laid before us by General Longstreet.

Neither general would probably wish to have a few sentences, such as are here given, taken to represent his whole mind on so large a subject. Nevertheless, it is always a point of some value to

notice what are the aspects of the art and science of war which are most forcibly and most constantly present to the mind of an able soldier, for he is almost sure to insist on them, rather than on others, when he has to decide between the advisability of certain plans and methods.

I must, however, express a feeling, which will, I think, be shared by many of those who fought against Generals Lee and Longstreet, that it is not pleasant to read reports by the surviving general of conversations between the two in which he seems to have treated, not to say reprimanded, his great leader more like a school-boy under instruction than like one of the most brilliant commanders and remarkable men of his own, if not of all, time. Whatever other great qualities as a soldier General Longstreet may possess,—and he certainly does possess some very brilliant qualities,—that of appreciating the military genius of the commander under whom he served cannot be reckoned among them.

Most of us think that one commander has seldom been more thoroughly outgeneralled by another than General Hooker was by Lee at the Battle of Chancellorsville. No one has expressed that view more strongly than have the distinguished soldiers who served under Hooker in that battle. Even those who express the warmest appreciation of the skill which Hooker displayed in the manœuvres which brought the army to Chancellorsville think very strongly that it was the difference between the two commanders which sent the Federal Army in retreat back over the Rappahannock, as the result of that battle.

In that battle at least one Federal corps had been utterly broken up and disorganized, though the Federal Army, much better armed, and with an artillery overwhelmingly powerful, numbered 130,000, and the Confederates only 60,000, men. With such a disproportion of force, that the effect of the battle should have been, not merely to stop the invasion of the South, but to open the way for the Confederate invasion of Pennsylvania, would seem, one would say, to imply that the Federals had been “outgeneralled.” Yet, on returning to the army, General Longstreet’s only view, not alone of this campaign, but of that in the Shenandoah Valley under Jackson, of the first and second Bull Run, and of the Peninsula campaign, appears to have been expressed by saying that “one mistake of the Confederacy was in pitting force against force. The only hope we had was to outgeneral

the Federals." "The time had come (*sic*) when it was imperative that the skill of generals and the strategy and tactics of war should take the place of muscle against muscle."

"We"—that is, Longstreet and Lee—"talked on that line from day to day, and General Lee, accepting it as a good military view, adopted it as the key-note of the campaign." I do not know how it will strike others, but to me there is something unspeakably pathetic about the picture of Lee—that man alike of marvellous modesty and marvellous genius, who by his skill and daring was then exciting the admiration of all that world from which he was cut off—thus closeted with his carping lieutenant. How could Lee do otherwise than accept it as the key-note of his campaign that he must endeavor to compensate for the numerical weakness of his army by the skill of his dispositions? On what else had he to rely than the devotion of his soldiers and their confidence in him? But how cruel a blow to such a man must it have been to discover that, after all their campaigns together, the general who was now left him as the right arm on which he must rely had formed this conclusion as to all his handling of the army in the past! Apart altogether from mere personal feeling, which, seeing that Lee was human, must have been sore enough, how serious a weakness did this disclose in one of the most important elements of his possible strength! Imagine the difference between having to rely for the carrying-out of your plans upon a soldier whose judgment and estimate of you were of this kind, and upon one who had for you the feeling which Jackson showed for Lee when he declared, "That man is a phenomenon. I would follow him blindfold anywhere." Yet it was from the same campaigns that the two great lieutenants of Lee had drawn these opposite conclusions.

We are not, however, left in any doubt as to the nature of the strategy which Longstreet desired to see adopted, or the nature of the experience on which he founded it. He writes:

"I then accepted his proposition to make a campaign into Pennsylvania, provided it should be offensive in strategy, but defensive in tactics, forcing the Federal Army to give us battle when we were in strong position and ready to receive them. . . . I stated to General Lee that, if he would allow me to handle my corps so as to receive the attack of the Federal Army, I would beat it off without calling on him for help except to guard my right and left, and called his attention to the battle of Fredericksburg as an instance of defensive warfare, where we had thrown not more than five thousand troops into the fight, and had beaten off two-thirds of the Federal Army, with great loss to them and slight loss to *my own* troops. I also called his attention to Napoleon's instructions to Marmont at the head of an invading army."

Now, it is certainly not wished to disparage the advantages of this method, where it can be adopted, of offensive strategy and of defensive tactics. Most generals believe distinctly in the possibility and advisability, under certain circumstances, of taking up such a position that by your doing so your enemy will be forced to elect between an attack under very great disadvantages upon your strong position and the abandonment of some most important object. But as the wise man has said of "every purpose under the sun," so it may be said of war, there is a time to attack and a time to refrain from attack, a time to defend and a time to abandon the defensive. Judged by the criticism General Longstreet offers of the action of others, his principle would appear to imply that, when an army has the opportunity of striking a series of blows against isolated fragments of its enemy, it ought to refrain from taking advantage of them in order to adopt the policy he advocates. It is needless to point out how directly that principle brings him into conflict with the admirable views on war of Stonewall Jackson, which were quoted in the article on this subject published in the July REVIEW.

Of the Fredericksburg campaign, apart from the battle, we unfortunately get very little account in these papers. Most students of war will, it is thought, consider the especial brilliancy of that campaign to have depended upon the mode in which Lee succeeded in bringing up Jackson exactly at the right moment. This was done so cleverly that the Federal commander committed himself to the attack on the Confederate Army under the impression that he had little more than Longstreet's corps to deal with. Without that application of Jackson's principle, Longstreet would have intrenched at Fredericksburg in vain. It is not often you can induce your antagonist to attack straight to his front the position you have worked at for weeks to strengthen, and especially where it is a position upon which he can bring no adequate artillery fire to bear. To quote Napoleon as meaning that, when an opportunity presents itself, you ought not to strike with your own concentrated army that of your enemy before it is concentrated; that you ought not, as Jackson did at Chancellorsville, to bring an overpowering force upon the flanks and rear of an exposed wing which can be dealt with before it is supported, will seem absurd to any one who knows what Napoleon did, and why it was he so severely criticised Marmont's proceedings.

Indeed, it is difficult to believe that an able soldier like General Longstreet can really mean this. There is often an indisposition, not uncommon among able men, to play second fiddle, and to be very critical of the first fiddle. It is easiest to account for General Longstreet's proceedings by assuming that he was no stranger to this feeling. In order to enforce the wisdom of the advice he gave his chief, General Longstreet records a forecast that he made in regard to the battle of Sedan. He would appear not to have closely studied the circumstances of that battle, for otherwise he would be aware that, while he was quite right in predicting that "MacMahon's army would be prisoners of war in ten days" from the time at which he spoke, he was entirely wrong as to the method by which that result would be brought about. The Prussians at Sedan did not "force MacMahon to attack," but attacked *him* on all sides. They carried Bazeilles after fierce and bloody attacks. They carried by attack La Moncelle, Daigny, Givonne, the plateaus above Floing and Illy, and the Bois de la Garenne. They only refrained from an actual attack with their infantry upon the immediate neighborhood of Sedan because, having already secured by attack all the positions which commanded the valley, they were able to bring such an overwhelming artillery fire to bear that the French position became untenable.

In no sense whatever is the battle of Sedan an example of offensive strategy and of defensive tactics. The campaign of 1870 and the principles of war followed by the German leaders are most unfortunate authorities for General Longstreet to appeal to in support of his special views. The modern German writers on war seem to enforce a theory the exact opposite to that of General Longstreet, to an exaggeration as extreme on their side as his appears to be on the other. They for the most part seem to admit as little as he does "that there is a time for every purpose under heaven"; there is, however, this one great difference between them: that, whereas he assumes the one great method of war to be that of offensive strategy and defensive tactics, they, most of them at least, continually urge that offensive strategy implies offensive tactics. They are also very strongly impressed with a view which, if we may judge from their conduct of war, appears to have been that of both Stonewall Jackson and of Grant, and perhaps that of Lee also—that defensive tactics carried on behind intrenched positions have a very dangerous tendency to unfit soldiers for all rapid

offensive action. That is a serious element in the whole question which must be taken into account. It is completely ignored in General Longstreet's criticism of Lee.

In these remarks, the actions of Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville have been taken together, as the story of those battles seems admirably to illustrate Lee's principles and method, and to clear the way for the discussion of Gettysburg also.

I cannot, however, pass on to the Gettysburg campaign without calling attention to Lee's mistake in allowing the Federal Army to escape across the Rappahannock after the battle of Fredericksburg. To command in war for many campaigns and make no mistakes is impossible. General Lee, great in strategy and able in tactics, is no exception to the wisdom of this saying. Military history can only be made of use to the student of war by a close criticism of every operation, and the critic, no matter how humble, should not shrink from pointing out what he conceives to be the errors and mistakes made by even the most renowned commanders. General Lee made some mistakes in his most brilliant career, but the greatest was after the battle of Fredericksburg. The more closely his conduct then is studied, the more inexplicable it appears. The reasons he gives in his published despatches for having failed either to push the Federal Army into the river or to compel its surrender are most unsatisfactory, most insufficient. (Page 82—note.) When the last Federal attack was repulsed on that eventful 13th December, Burnside's army was at Lee's mercy. It is, however, easy to be wise after the event, and to point out what might or ought to have been done. When Wellington realized that the battle of Waterloo was won, he is proverbially reported to have suddenly shut up the telescope through which he had been looking, and to have given the order, "Up, Guards, and at 'em." He felt that the time had come for passing from the defensive to the active offensive, for he saw that Napoleon's army had been delivered into his hands. Yet that army had no unfordable river, like the Rappahannock, immediately behind it. Had the French army on the evening of the 18th June, 1815, been situated as Burnside's army was on the evening of the 13th December, 1862, none of it could ever have succeeded in recrossing the Belgian frontier into France.

It has always seemed to me that, if Burnside's army had been destroyed, as it ought to have been, after its crushing repulse at

Fredericksburg, the struggle between North and South would have assumed an entirely different aspect, and subsequent events would not have been as they were. That army was by far and in every way the finest under the Federal flag, and was the nucleus of that which afterwards fought at Gettysburg, and which eventually forced General Lee to surrender. The prize in front of the great Confederate general was enormous. He would doubtless have lost very heavily had he left his position of vantage to push the defeated Federals into the Rappahannock, but the losses at Chancellorsville and by many other subsequent battles might have been thereby saved. Lee does not seem to have realized how great was the Federal loss and how serious the demoralization of their army on the evening of the 13th December. He made up his mind that Burnside would renew the fight next morning, and the pages of *The Century* magazine tell us how fairly justified he was in thinking this, as they show that Burnside meant to have done so. Had the Federals attacked again on either the 14th or 15th December, judging from Lee's general mode of fighting, I think we are entitled to assume that he would, without doubt, have followed up a second repulse of the Federal attack by such an immediate and vigorous offensive as would have annihilated Burnside's army. It must be admitted that, whilst Lee's position was admirable for a passive defence, it was very bad for the sudden assumption of an active forward offensive when the enemy's attacks upon it had been even crushingly repulsed.

During the course of this long war some great opportunities were lost by the Confederacy for the delivery of a death-blow to the Northern armies. But upon no other occasion was the opportunity so apparent, or the results that would have attended success so evident, as at Fredericksburg. That battle was a brilliant success. Lee ought to have made it a crushing, if not a final, victory.

Burnside's retreat to the North bank of the Rappahannock during the stormy night of the 15th December was admirably conducted, and most creditable to the Federal generals and staff officers who carried it out.

Every one is agreed that the first day's fight of Gettysburg was brought on without Lee's having expected it. On that day two Federal corps had been severely handled by very superior Confederate forces. The Federal Army was neither concentrated nor

were its corps near enough to the battle-field to be concentrated by the time that the Confederate Army ought to have been able to attack them. The evidence adduced as to the position of the Confederate corps is incontrovertible. Colonel Allen, in his reply to General Longstreet (page 355), has shown conclusively, not only that the reports of all the division commanders at the time are directly against General Longstreet's assertion that his divisions were "fifteen or twenty miles away from the battle-field on the night between the 1st and 2d July," but that General Longstreet's own official report at the time contradicts his recent statement on this point. The soldier instinctively admires the fine fighting qualities of General Longstreet, but the student of war called upon to express an opinion upon his conduct, when second in command to General Lee, sees much to find fault with. General Longstreet tells us (page 340) of his somewhat fierce discussion with his chief on the afternoon of the 1st July as to the plans that should be followed in the next day's battle. The account we have already had of his earlier conversations with Lee upon the general conduct of the war throws an interesting light upon what must have passed through Lee's mind during those discussions.

That Lee felt the necessity of keeping on the kindest terms with his able, but argument-loving, lieutenant is evident. He bore with characteristic humility what must be termed the essentially disrespectful attitude of mind towards him of the man on whom he was obliged to rely for the most important stroke of the whole war. But that all the time Lee's own mind remained clearly fixed on the policy of adopting either offensive or defensive tactics, according to circumstances, is manifest from the firmness with which he rejected Longstreet's proposed plans. He was determined not to lose the opportunity which chance had thrown in his way, for the very doubtful possibility of being able to manoeuvre round the Federal army—an operation which would, at least, certainly afford that army time to concentrate against him. By all that is recorded in this volume of General Longstreet, by his whole conduct on the 2nd and 3rd July, and by the tone and temper of his present writings, it seems very evident that he quitted Lee on the night between those two days with his mind filled with the fixed idea of defensive tactics. His thoughts were apparently too much absorbed with his own plans to admit

of his paying a properly strict attention to the orders and directions of his chief. Yet upon their prompt and accurate execution depended the success of Lee's far more brilliant and far wiser scheme of action.

General Longstreet has appealed to Napoleon. Those who have most carefully studied Napoleon's methods and habit will think, I believe, that Napoleon in Lee's place would have attacked in the early morning of July 2, as Lee intended to do. Those who have closely followed the history of this war will also be inclined to think that, if Jackson had been in Longstreet's place, the attack would have been delivered before 10 A. M. at the latest.

With the evidence given in this volume before us, few can doubt the truth of Colonel Allan's statement (page 356) that

"General Longstreet, though knowing fully the condition of things on the night of the 1st, knowing that Lee had decided to attack that part of the Federal Army in his front, knowing that every hour strengthened Meade and diminished the chances of Confederate success, and knowing that his corps was to open the battle and deliver the main assault, consumed the time from daylight to nearly 4 P. M., on July 2, in moving his troops about four miles over no serious obstacle and in getting them into battle."

The evidence now laid before us goes far to show that General Longstreet was not only responsible for the fact that his own wing attacked so late that almost the whole Federal Army was concentrated before the stroke was delivered, but also for the fact that he was, when the attack was delivered, not properly supported by the other parts of the army detailed to coöperate in the attack. When the principal attack, on which all others depend, is delivered at least six hours later than it is ordered to be delivered, it is impossible that coöperating corps should time their movements so as to support it. General Longstreet has clinched the evidence as to the cause of the imperfect success of the battle on the second day, by urging that Lee had not ordered the attack to be delivered at the earliest possible hour on the 2d July. The direct evidence brought against him on this point is, however, very clear, although even without such evidence it would still be clear to all who closely study this great battle that the whole point and scheme of Lee's battle manifestly depended on the attack being delivered at the earliest possible moment. If General Longstreet had not been too much absorbed by his own ideas of the way in which the campaign ought to have been fought, to pay attention to the literal and prompt execution of his chief's orders,

he must have seen for himself that suddenness and earliness in the attack were of the essence of that scheme.

Similarly, in the third day's battle all the evidence goes to show that, if Pickett's attack had been supported by the whole force of Longstreet's corps and the division and a half of H. P. Hill's corps, which were put at his disposal, that attack would have succeeded. The picture of General Longstreet not even able to make up his mind to order the charge of Pickett's division recalls the bitter memories of our own attack upon the Redan in September, 1855. Upon that occasion our final repulse was due to want of support. No effective arrangements had been made to reënforce the British troops engaged in the assault, who, left without support, were easily disposed of by the fresh troops of the enemy brought to bear on them. No operation in war is so bloody, nothing is so cruel to all concerned, as the weak decision which allows an insufficient force to engage in an attack from a disinclination to expose more than a small number of men to the risks it entails. How many serious disasters have been occasioned by the tender-heartedness of the commander who lacked the moral courage to launch heavy columns in support of men engaged in an attack like that attempted by General Pickett!

As to Lee's decision to attack on the third day of Gettysburg, intending that attack to be adequately supported (as, however it was not), it is very interesting to compare this battle with that of Grant at Chattanooga. Few will contend that the advantages which General Grant had gained during the first two days' fight at Chattanooga were so great as those which Lee had gained in the first two days' fight at Gettysburg. On the first day at Chattanooga, the 23d November, 1863, Thomas's force seized the picket lines of the enemy in front of him by a sudden rush. On the 24th, Hooker, on the right, drove in a small force of the enemy, and secured the evacuation of Lookout Mountain, and Sherman forced his way to a position detached from the enemy's right; but up to the moment when the successful charge was made in the centre by Thomas, General Sherman had entirely failed to force his way on the left, and General Hooker had not made good his advance on the right. No doubt the charge of Thomas, as actually ordered, was not intended to be carried forward in the way it was. But a comparison between the circumstances of Thomas's successful charge at Chattanooga with the

failure of Pickett at Gettysburg will show that a large element of the uncertain prevailed in each case, and that it by no means follows that, because Pickett's charge proved in fact disastrous, Lee was therefore wrong to order it, or that, if it had been properly supported, it would not have succeeded. Even if we had not the direct and specific evidence of General Imboden, we could not doubt that the words he has quoted must have represented the secret thoughts of Lee.

"I never saw troops behave more magnificently than Pickett's division of Virginians did to-day in that grand charge upon the enemy. And if they had been supported as they were to have been,—but for some reason not yet fully explained to me, were not,—we would have held the position, and the day would have been ours."

After a moment's pause he added in a loud voice, in a tone almost of agony, "Too bad ! Too bad ! Oh, too bad !" (Page 421.)

The whole story, as told by General Imboden, of that casual meeting with Lee at 1 A. M. the morning after the last day's battle, seems to leave no doubt as to what Lee's view of the facts really was. Nothing is more characteristic of the man than that, when quietly reviewing the situation, he should realize how all-important it was to the cause of the Confederacy that no personal differences should arise between him and Longstreet, and that he should consequently have taken all the blame upon himself. Most soldiers will think that General Longstreet has not served his own cause well by appealing so much to the generous silence of his chief. He has, at least as far as all future histories of the war are concerned, deprived himself of the benefit of that silence by the way in which he has laid himself out to make charges against the chief who refrained, under the most dire provocation, from one word of reproach against him. The sneer about the appointment of Virginians to command has been well answered by Colonel Allen ; the sneer about Stuart's "wild ride around the Federal army" (page 355), which General Longstreet asserts was undertaken in disobedience of his own orders, is unfortunate, as Colonel Mosby (page 251) shows from the original document that it was made by General Longstreet's own order, after the question had been expressly referred to him by General Lee : the errors he has fallen into as to the position of his own corps prior to Gettysburg are similarly confuted by the original documents. These, and not a few other matters of similar character, seem to deprive Gen.

eral Longstreet's statements of at least some of their value as evidence, and his criticism of all value as that of an unbiassed judge.

There is in the record of General Longstreet's battles a uniformity of incident as marked as that noticed in the case of some other generals. In the first day's fight at Seven Pines, according to all the best evidence that is before us, General Longstreet's division was so long in getting into position and preparing for attack that the whole scheme of General J. E. Johnston miscarried. General Johnston has too great a respect for his lieutenant, and is too generous a man, to reproach him for the miscarriage. At the second Bull Run, according to General Longstreet's own report (page 519, Vol. II.),

"As soon as the troops were arranged, General Lee expressed a wish to have me attack. The change of position on the part of the Federals, however, involved sufficient delay for a reconnoissance on our part. . . . The position was not inviting, and so I reported to General Lee. . . . General Lee was quite disappointed by my report against immediate attack along the turnpike. . . . General Lee urged me to go in, and, of course, I was anxious to meet his wishes. At the same time I wanted more than anything else to know that my troops had a chance to accomplish what they might undertake."

And so on *ad libitum*—Lee always anxious for attack; Longstreet deliberating and postponing action. In his one brilliant and successful attack during all these battles—that at Chickamauga—Longstreet, being commander of the Confederate left wing, and having orders (page 652, Vol. III.) from Bragg to "begin at day-break," did not (page 655) "advance until noon," by which time the action of the other wing had caused a gap in the Federal lines through which Longstreet, brilliantly taking advantage of the error, advanced and caused the Federal defeat. "Discovering, with the true instinct of a soldier, that he could do more by turning to the right, he disregarded the order to wheel to the left, and wheeled the other way." Destiny may have shaped these results, but one is much mistaken if there is not evident in each of these actions the hand and mind of the same man who rough-hewed each of them according to the same temperament—the hand of one man who was much better adapted to repair the errors of a second-rate commander than to carry out the purposes of such a chief as Lee. There is a greatness of soul which may be shown in subordinating even a better judgment to the perfect carrying-out of the scheme of a leader who has the right to decide. Of any recognition of that fact on General Longstreet's part in his relations with Lee, no trace is to be found in any one

of these actions. That Longstreet was a brilliant leader of a division or wing in action there can be no doubt, but he seems never to have been able—perhaps from some peculiarity of temperament—to subordinate his own views heartily to the views and orders of his great chief. The impartial military critic must admit that at Seven Pines, the second Bull Run, and Gettysburg, the Confederacy paid dearly for that defect in his character.

In one respect there is a rather remarkable similarity in the incidents of the Gettysburg and of the Chancellorsville campaign. In the latter campaign nearly the whole of the Federal cavalry had been detached from the army in order to throw itself between Lee's position on the Rappahannock and his base at Richmond. The major portion of the Federal Army then crossed the Rappahannock, and the battle of Chancellorsville was fought whilst the Federal cavalry was thus absent. During the Gettysburg campaign, Stuart, with a large portion of the Confederate cavalry, had been detached round the rear of Meade's army, and the other portion of the cavalry, having been, by the course of the movements, thrown out of the line between the two armies, Lee was left with no cavalry in his front at the moment when the collision between the two armies unexpectedly occurred at Gettysburg. There is just this difference—that during the Gettysburg campaign the absence of the cavalry was contrary to Lee's intention. He had calculated upon its being possible for Stuart to return to him before the collision should take place. The difficulty which a body of men, launched like those of Stuart upon the rear of an army, find themselves in, is well likened to the position of a man turned blindfold in a room full of enemies. It was that difficulty which prevented Stuart's return till the eve of the battle. In the case of the Chancellorsville campaign, Hooker's scheme deliberately involved his being deprived of the services of the cavalry during the course of his whole campaign. In both cases alike the result seems to show that, when armies are manœuvring against one another in the field, it is a risk too great to be worth running, even for the sake of breaking in upon the communications of an enemy, to deprive the army of its eyes, as one must do if the bulk of mounted troops are sent off on some entirely isolated operation.

The case of Stuart's ride around McClellan, during the Peninsula campaign, is altogether different. There the armies were for the time stationary when opposite one another. Lee had no

intention of undertaking any movement till his cavalry had returned. Stuart brought back most valuable information, which assisted greatly in the general movements of the subsequent campaign. Similarly, the partisan work of small parties like that of Colonel Mosby may serve a most useful purpose, and cannot be conducted with too much audacity. But Stoneman's raid seems to have gained advantages for the Federal Army which, though important, were dearly purchased by the loss of the battle of Chancellorsville. The more one considers that battle, the more clear it becomes that it was the absence of the Federal cavalry which made possible Jackson's turning movement. Under ordinary circumstances, the detachment of so large a force as that of Jackson's to move at first completely away from the battle-field, and then round the enemy's flank and rear, would be a very risky undertaking. It was possible and successful, first, because from the nature of the country nothing of the movement could be seen from the actual Federal position until it was too late, and, secondly, because the Confederate cavalry were able, in the absence of any corresponding force on the other side, to feel all the approaches to the Federal position and to ascertain exactly where their right wing lay. The small number of possible exits from the Federal position towards that of Lee made it possible for Lee to hold them as if they were defiles, whilst Jackson, with the help of the cavalry, was working round to the vulnerable point.

The whole story of the Federal action during these battles seems to carry the same moral as that which is pressed in my first article. The decisions from Washington and the criticisms from Washington, based upon the loose and rampant public opinion of the day, were in every instance wrong, and were disastrous to the cause of the Union. Well would it be if the survivors of the Administration by which those hasty judgments were formed would now realize what the effect was of their deciding upon the course of action to be taken without having before them any of the data for such decisions. If now they would only understand the danger they entailed upon their country by their interference in the conduct of war—the most difficult of all arts—without any knowledge of its methods or of its principles, one might hope that the chastened and wise public opinion so formed would be an incalculable future benefit to all self-governing nations.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

WOLSELEY.

THE COMING CONGRESS.

BY THE HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

THE FIRST session of the Fifty-first Congress promises to be a very interesting as well as a very important one. For the first time in fifteen years every branch of the national government is in the control of the same political party, for in 1881, although the Republicans organized the Senate, it was equally divided, and Mr. David Davis was in the chair. Now, however, each branch of Congress, and the Executive as well, is fairly within the control of the Republican party, and this condition of things, occurring as it does after an interval of so many years, ought of itself to produce effective legislative action. The only hindrance to efficient party control is the very narrow majority by which the Republicans hold the House; but this would have comparatively little effect on the transaction of general public business were it not for the existence of a much more radical evil which is destroying the life of the Lower House, and which for some time has made all majorities powerless. The evil to which I refer lies, of course, in the body of rules under which the House now exists. Originally reasonable, and established to facilitate the transaction of business, the rules of the House have been developed into an ingenious contrivance for stopping practically all legislative action which does not receive a unanimous vote. The development has been slow, but the result is as complete as it is pernicious.

The American House of Representatives to-day is a complete travesty upon representative government, upon popular government, and upon government by the majority. The purpose of the rules, as I have just said, is merely to facilitate the transaction of public business, but they have become so perverted that they serve only to stop public business, and when they are attacked we are met by a cry about the "rights of the minority"! The "rights of

the minority" have been so well protected in the House that the rights of the majority have disappeared. If the minority, in thus usurping the rights of the majority, could act and could govern, as they do in the Southern States, we might object to the system as wrong and unconstitutional, but it could, at least, be said for it that it was not stagnation. In the House of Representatives, however, the minority simply reduce the majority to their own impotent condition, and the upshot is that nobody governs and nothing is done. The last Congress, which was in longer continuous session than any other Congress in our history, if we throw aside the measures which received unanimous consent, passed practically nothing except one great party measure, and that went through merely because the opposition chose to allow it to pass. It seems almost incredible that men should be found in the United States to defend a system like this, for the government of the United States proceeds, if on nothing else, on the theory that the majority ought to govern. Yet the theory on which the House of Representatives was organized in the last Congress was that the majority ought not to govern. If the system of rules in the House of Representatives is right, then the entire American system of government from top to bottom is wrong. The minority in the national House have the right to debate any important measure, and to debate it amply. They have the further right to sufficient time to call the attention of the country to any measure; that is, they have the right to prevent a measure from being smuggled through or passed hastily, without sufficient discussion, and under the party whip. But beyond this they have no rights, except to appeal to the people at the next election. If they had, they would not be a minority, but a majority, and in control of the government. The opportunities for obstruction under the Constitution, and under any system of rules that may be adopted, are more than enough, but the time has come when these artificial fetters must be taken off the House of Representatives. If a majority cannot be trusted to rule in this country, then we should try something else; but while we live under the majority system a majority ought to have, and must have, a chance to act.

This question of restoring movement to the House of Representatives is that which will confront the Fifty-first Congress at the threshold of its existence. It is not a party question, or ought

not to be, and although, from the stand-point of party advantage alone, it would be an admirable thing for the Republicans to have the Democrats make a desperate struggle in favor of the old paralyzing rules, it is much to be hoped that sufficient changes and reforms will be made by general consent to change the condition of the House from dead rot to vitality, and enable it to carry out the wishes of the majority of the American people, whatever those wishes happen to be. There are indications that public opinion is becoming aroused to the disgraceful condition of the rules under which the House has lately been stagnating, and if press and people will demand that the House fulfil the purpose for which it exists, a valuable result will be speedily accomplished.

The contest over the rules is the first thing with which the Fifty-first Congress will be called on to deal, and until it is settled nothing else, practically, can be done. When this is settled,—and it must be settled rightly, or else the Fifty-first Congress will never do anything except wrangle over the rules,—the time will come for dealing with other measures of a widely different character from a set of parliamentary regulations upon which the legislative machine revolves.

What these measures shall be, and in what order they shall be taken up, no one, of course, can say until Congress assembles and the Republican caucus determines on some line of action. It may fairly be inferred, however, that the first business which will engage the attention of the House will be the reduction of the surplus revenue, for this action is imperatively demanded by the business interests of the country, and the party in power is completely pledged to it. The Democrats, under their free-trade leadership in the last campaign, argued throughout, both in Congress and before the people, that the question at issue was whether the surplus should be reduced or maintained. This, of course, was totally misleading, to use a very mild word, for the Republicans are quite as deeply pledged to reduce the surplus as the Democrats. It would be manifestly unfair, however, to condemn any party for inaccuracy of statement when that statement was made during an exciting campaign, in which the stress of battle was very great and the temptation to crush truth to earth was correspondingly strong. But thoughtful persons must have observed with pain and surprise that, even since the election was over, the ardent Free-Traders have continued to argue as if the con-

flict was still over the reduction of the surplus, and that the Republican victory meant its perpetuation. It might be matter for curious inquiry to determine whether this continued perversion of the real issue was due to ignorance of public affairs, or to that professional enthusiasm for reform which unthinking persons sometimes call disingenuousness. It is not necessary, however, to enter upon a discussion of that point here. The real issue has never been, and is not now, whether the surplus revenue should be maintained, for both parties are agreed that it ought to be abolished. The real issue of the last campaign was how that work should be performed—whether in accordance with the principles which would lead toward free trade, or with those which would insure the maintenance of the protective system. The verdict of the ballot-box was in favor of the Republican party, or, in other words, it was decided at the polls that the reduction of the surplus and the revision of the tariff should be made upon the protective principle. The method by which the surplus shall be reduced has therefore been settled,—a point which our free-trade friends, with their minds occupied with higher things, are prone to overlook,—and it only remains for the Republican party to fulfil its pledge of reducing the surplus revenue, and thoroughly revising and adjusting the tariff in accordance with the principles on which it has been carried to victory.

It would be manifestly unbecoming for me, or for any single member of the House, to attempt to indicate before the assembling of the Republican Congressmen and Senators the precise manner in which this work should be accomplished. There can, however, be little doubt, I suppose, in any one's mind that it will proceed in a general way upon the lines marked out by the Senate bill in the last Congress, which was the product of some of the ablest of the Republican leaders, and which in its main features received at the time the general approval of the party in Congress. The central principle of that bill was to reduce the surplus by taking off the tax on tobacco and by reducing very heavily the duties on sugar. The minute and careful revision of the tariff which accompanied this reduction it is unnecessary to discuss here, even were it possible; but it can be seen that the general policy of the Senate bill not only gets rid of the surplus, but brings relief to a great agricultural interest in the South, and to the entire body of the people

also, who are, of course, all consumers of sugar. Whether the recent growth and development of the Sugar Trust will lead Congress to feel that the sugar duties ought to be wholly abolished, or reduced in a most sweeping manner, remains to be seen, but there is no doubt that this new problem is one which will receive careful consideration when Congress meets. Such a reduction as that suggested by the Senate bill, however, whether it is confined to the original limits, or whether it makes a more sweeping reduction of the sugar duties, would undoubtedly pass, for even if the Republicans did not have a majority in both houses, the interests of the border States are too deeply involved in the removal of the tobacco tax to permit the defeat of any measure providing that relief. The passage of such a bill, therefore, would result in the removal of the surplus revenue for some years, and the consequent disappearance of that particular phase of the economic question from our politics. It would then remain to be seen how a free-trade movement simply for the purposes of free trade, and stripped of its pretences about the dangers of a surplus, would prosper.

There is another matter, more important than any tariff can ever be, which is certain to receive the careful consideration of Congress, although it played but a slight part in the last campaign. This is the question of protecting the ballot by suitable legislation. Public attention has been drawn more and more of late years to this vital subject, and several of the States have made great efforts to guard the purity and honesty of the ballot by the most careful and elaborate legislation that could be devised. There is a disposition, however, in certain quarters, whenever the ballot is discussed from a national stand-point, to take the ground that it is a mere bit of party manœuvring, intended solely as a party cry and to procure a sectional advantage. As the matter stands to-day, this is a wholly mistaken as well as a thoroughly disingenuous position. There is no desire anywhere to revive the sectional animosities of the War, but there is a very general wish and a widespread determination among the people of the North, at least, to have a fair ballot throughout the length and breadth of the land. There is, of course, no doubt of the power of Congress to pass a federal election law for the purpose of regulating the elections which decide the choice of electors and members of Congress. There can be almost as little question of the expediency of a simple but efficient statute which shall

make federal elections as honest as it is possible to make them by legal provisions. Such a law, thoroughly enforced, would be of great value in many districts both North and South, for it would greatly reduce, if not entirely prevent, violence, fraud, false counting, and the use of money for corrupt purposes. The States have enough to do to guard the purity of their own elections, and the protection of federal elections by the United States would be of great advantage to the ballot everywhere. The political party or the political leaders who resist, directly or indirectly, such a law as this, lay themselves open to the imputation that they have something to lose by its enactment, and that they fear an honest ballot.

The question, however, is one of those which cannot be evaded or put aside, and which will not down at any one's bidding. It is an oft-repeated truism that the purity of the ballot lies at the very foundation of our government, but it is not equally well understood that popular confidence in the verdict of the ballot-box is quite as important as the honesty of the verdict itself. At the present time it is believed, rightly or wrongly, by large masses of the American people, that there is no such thing as a fair election in certain parts of the country. This belief, whether well founded or not, is a real and growing danger, which ought to be removed at all hazards, and the next Congress will, therefore, fall far short of its duty and of the expectations of the people if it fails to pass an effective election law. The cry which is sometimes raised that no election law can be enforced in certain parts of the United States is idle. The day has gone by when a law executed by the officers of the United States, and with the power of the United States behind it, can be either disregarded or violated with safety. If an election law properly drawn is passed by Congress, it will be enforced, and although it may not put a stop to all the evils which exist, it will so greatly improve the condition of things, and will do so much toward the restoration of an honest and unquestioned ballot everywhere, that the only wonder will be that we have gone so long without it.

It is impossible, of course, within the limits of a magazine article to attempt to discuss the provisions of such an election law. A bill to regulate elections was introduced by Senator Sherman in the last Congress and will probably be before the next, and it is likely that there will be others submitted looking to the

same general object. The recent laws of some of the States will also serve as material, and although it may be doubted whether the Australian system, which has been adopted in Massachusetts and elsewhere, could be used for a federal system, it seems probable that it contains features which might be applied with advantage. One thing seems certain, and that is—if one can judge from indications of popular sentiment in many of the States—that Congress will be expected by the people to deal with this problem, and that, if the Republican party take it up as a party measure, they will have the cordial support of the country in passing such a law to guard the ballot-box.

After the tariff and the ballot, the most important matter before Congress will be one that requires no new legislation. This sounds like a paradox, but is true of the civil-service question. There is enough legislation now on this subject, for the time has not yet come when the four-years' tenure can be profitably repealed. To remove it now would simply make all tenures indeterminate, and experience shows that indeterminate tenures are as yet no protection, while the four-years' tenure is. In time, this and other improvements can be made, but for the present we have law enough, and all that we require is its maintenance, extension, and enforcement. The President can extend the existing law to other branches of the service and to the smaller custom-houses and post-offices, as he has done already in the case of railway mail clerks; and to enable him to do this it is only necessary to make a proper appropriation for the work of the Commission. This appropriation is now miserably inadequate, and its increase is the vital point to which all supporters of the reform, both in the press and elsewhere, should direct their efforts. It is probable that there will be a contest over this, for the honest and vigorous enforcement of the law since March 4, 1889, has roused its enemies, and attacks in Congress will probably be the consequence. Neither party, however, can afford to have any hand in the open repeal of the law or in an indirect assault by way of cutting off appropriations. The matter has gone too far for that. The distribution of patronage, inevitable for any President or any party under the present system, grows more and more distasteful to the people, and the extension of the Civil-Service Law meets always with the approbation of the great mass of voters who desire only good service and better standards of public life. It is in the latter direction,

which is too often overlooked, that the system of patronage is peculiarly odious. It has converted Congress into a machine for the division of offices, for which it was never intended, and by which its powers are cramped, its action is impeded, and its character injured. Quite recently one of the ablest and most distinguished of Republican leaders, the Hon. William McKinley, has said in an interview that the Republicans are less well able to deal promptly and effectively with the tariff now than they would have been last Spring, when they were not divided by the struggles for offices. What more bitter commentary could be uttered ! And yet no one who knows the conditions of politics can question the fact that the system of patronage weakens and degrades parties and public men, and will continue to do so as long as it exists. In order to rid our public life of a system as un-American as it is unintelligent, Congress needs only to make such an appropriation as will permit the President to extend the law wherever it can be applied, and enable the Commission to carry it out thoroughly and effectively.

The questions of the tariff and of a federal election law will, it seems probable, take up more of the time and attention of the Fifty-first Congress than anything else, for the leaders of the opposition, in some recent utterances, appear to indicate their intention to make a protracted resistance on both these points. Of the wisdom of this resistance it is not for a Republican to speak, but the nature of the questions is such that, from the stand-point of party advantage, the Republican party may be well content to meet the resistance of the opposition. Such a resistance, especially if carried to undue lengths, will not only be unprofitable in itself, but will be injurious to those who indulge in it on many accounts, and particularly because there are so many other measures that have gradually accumulated in the stagnation caused by the rules, which demand the attention of Congress and which interest large bodies of people throughout the country. Such, for instance, is the Blair Bill, which, whatever its merits, has too large and too serious a support, and involves interests too important, to be any longer disposed of by the process of suffocation in the committee-room. Whether the measure is wise or unwise, it is entitled to a fair hearing and a direct vote. Another measure which passed the Senate, and was favored by two-thirds of the House in the last Congress, was the

Copyright Bill. It was finally choked off because the Funding Bill happened to stand ahead of it on suspension day ; but it is a great measure of honesty and justice, as well as of vast benefit to all the interests involved, and the time has come when it, too, should have fair discussion and the decision of a vote. Still another question in which there is the widest possible interest is that of immigration. The last Congress appointed a committee who held hearings on this subject and took a great deal of very valuable testimony, which was printed in their report ; but the report and the bill alike came to the House too late for action, and the result is that this question, in regard to which there is a great deal of popular feeling, will come to this Congress for decision.

There are many other questions as to which something might be said, such as the Bankruptcy Act, the Refunding Bill, and the proposed amendment of the Inter-State-Commerce Law ; but enough has been said to show the great importance of the matters with which the Fifty-first Congress will be called upon to deal. If they fail to act upon these matters, their inaction will meet with severe rebuke at the polls a year hence, unless I greatly misapprehend the popular temper. The people of this country are, as it seems to me, thoroughly tired of the stagnation of business and the general inaction of Congress. They are disgusted to see year after year go by and great measures affecting the business and political interests of the country accumulate at the doors of Congress and never reach the stage of action. They have also waked up to the fact that this impotence and stagnation are due to the preposterous fabric known as the rules of the House, and they are prepared to support heartily that party and those leaders who will break down those rules and allow the current of legislation to flow in its natural channel and at its proper rate. I end, therefore, where I began—by saying that the first session of the Fifty-first Congress promises to be of great interest and importance, and that the first thing to be done is to change the rules of the House thoroughly and effectively, so that the legislation of the United States may be no longer at the mercy of any handful of men who, for personal or party reasons, choose to arrest it in defiance of the majority of the people and of a majority of the House itself.

HENRY CABOT LODGE.

WHY I AM AN EPISCOPALIAN.

BY FREDERIC WILLIAM FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., ARCHDEACON AND
CANON OF WESTMINSTER.

I HOPE that I may be able to answer this question without aggressiveness and without extravagance. A man may surely be convinced in his own mind without resenting or condemning the opposite opinion of his neighbor. Truth is many-sided and "God has *many* bests."

It is more than possible that my reasons for being an Episcopalian may seem entirely inadequate on the side of defect to my fellow-Episcopalians, as well as on the side of excess to those who belong to other religious communities. Be it so. A man must say what he thinks, and not trim his sails to every passing gust of the popular breeze. When Phocion was once accidentally applauded during the delivery of a speech, he turned round to a friend in surprise and asked: "Have I said anything *wrong*, then?" When Rostopchin, the Governor of Moscow, was told that he was growing very popular, he exclaimed: "*Mon Dieu!* what blunder have I committed?"

There are two common ways of winning general approval, or, at any rate, of escaping the penalties of arousing antagonism. One is by assuming a strong party position, and answering according to its idols the particular audience which you wish to conciliate. By doing this a man can always secure the support and enthusiasm of vehement partisans. The other way is by never asserting even the most incontrovertible proposition without securing yourself by the assertion that "you do not mean to exclude its contradictory," and by "steering through the channel of no-meaning between the Scylla and Charybdis of 'yes' and 'no'." He who takes the latter course, says Cardinal Newman, will be regarded as "your safe man and the hope of the church." On the other hand, we know the fate of him who goeth about to persuade a multitude that they are in the wrong. Be that as it

may, all my readers, be they partisans or moderates, be they hostile or favorable, may at least rest assured of this: that no amount of theological hatred or ecclesiastical opposition, no fear of persecution and no hope of reward, will ever make me deflect the tenth part of an inch from the statement of anything which I hold to be true, or will ever tempt me to the support of anything which I hold to be untenable or false.

Let me begin, then, by saying that, though I am a convinced Episcopalian, I hold the question of church organization to be altogether secondary and subordinate, and in no sense essential to morality or salvation. I consider episcopacy to be in most cases the best, the most authorized, and, in its rudiments at least, the most ancient form of church government; but I do not regard it as one of the necessary notes of a true church, nor do I consider it to be at all indispensable for the *esse*, or even for the *bene esse*, of any church. The Thirty-nine Articles define "the visible church" to be a "congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." The Prayer-book, in its most solemn service, speaks of Christians as "very members incorporate in the mystical body of Christ, which is the blessed company of *all faithful people*." Neither here nor in any document of the Church of England is episcopacy insisted on as a thing indispensable. Abraham Lincoln used to say: "Whenever I find a church which inscribes upon its portals the two rules, 'Thou shalt love God with all thy heart' and 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,' to that church will I belong." If that be thought altogether too vague a note of unity, shall we be contented with the rule of Irenæus, "*Ubi spiritus ibi ecclesia*"? or with that of William Penn, "The humble, meek, merciful, pious, just, devout souls are everywhere of one religion; and when death hath taken off the mask they will know one another, though the divers liveries they wear here make them strangers"?

Or, to bring the question more closely home, do we or do we not believe that there is a church of the redeemed in heaven? And is there a human being who supposes that the soul of any man which is admitted into that beatific communion will be questioned whether on earth he accepted or not an episcopal government? Let us avoid the arrogant nonsense of extremes. Let us shun

the pompous platitudes which can only be saved from intolerant and extravagant absurdity by first being emphatically asserted, and then ridiculously explained away. Such a platitude is that which first identifies the church with one of its component bodies, and then says with St. Cyprian, "*Extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*" The assertion sounds very grand, very orthodox, very faithful; but when you come to question even the Romish casuists, they are constrained to admit that even Jews and Pagans may be saved, so that, unless they stretch the significance of the word *ecclesia* till its whole meaning cracks, their platitude becomes an empty phrase. Churches will not be estimated hereafter by the boastful arrogance of their claims or the narrow and bitter exclusiveness of their champions, but by the fruitfulness of their works and the beauty of their holiness. The revival and exaggeration of Romish principles in Reformed churches may make these views appear lax to some; yet they are almost *totidem verbis et litteris* the views of some of our most honored divines. Hooker, for instance, has been regarded for three centuries as the most eminent and judicious champion of High-Church principles; yet Hooker says, as William Penn says, that the unity of the church consists in owning one Lord, professing one faith, and being initiated by one baptism; and "in whomsoever these things are, the church doth acknowledge them as her children; them only she holdeth for aliens and strangers in whom these things are not found."

It naturally follows that, though episcopacy seems to me to have the divine *sanction*, I do not in any sense regard episcopacy as a thing of immediate divine *institution* or universal obligation, any more than I regard monarchy. A state may be blessed and flourishing without kings, and a church may be blessed and flourishing without bishops. I do not believe that our Lord, in founding upon earth a divine society, meant also, of necessity, to establish an unvarying organization. He left us an eternal revelation; he reconciled us to the Father; he saved us from the power of sin and death; he set us an example, that we should follow his steps. His work was quite infinitely more transcendent than the mere establishment of a particular model of church government. He gave his Holy Spirit to them that seek him, and under that guidance it was and is perfectly competent for every nation and every separated community of Christians, under the stress of circumstances, to adopt that form of church

government which was or is best suited to its needs. Even to the truest members of his true church—even to the *ecclesiola in ecclesia*—Christ said: “Other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be”—not one FOLD (*αὐλή*), but—“one FLOCK (*ποιμνιον*), and one shepherd.” There is but one *flock*; there are, and to the end of time there always will be, many *folds*.

I neither affirm nor deny what is called the doctrine of “Apostolical Succession.” Even Archbishop Laud, the *beau ideal* of the High-Churchman, in his controversy with Fisher the Jesuit, ventured to say no more respecting it than that “it is a great happiness where it may be had visible and continued, and a great conquest over the mutability of this present world. But I do not find any one of the ancient fathers that makes local, personal, visible, and continued succession a necessary mark or sign of the true church in any one place.” As an historic fact, I consider it highly probable—indeed, almost certain—that our bishops hold their office by the laying-on of hands, either of presbyters or bishops, from the days of the Apostles. But I do not believe for a moment that the continuity of spiritual gifts is exclusively dependent on these mechanical transmissions; for, as Hooker says, “Men may be extraordinarily yet allowably . . . admitted unto spiritual functions in the church . . . when God himself doth of himself raise up any whose labor he useth without requiring that men should authorize them.” I believe that not a few of the best and greatest servants of God in the Christian dispensation have been anointed only by the hands of invisible consecration. If, therefore, it could be shown that there were broken links in the chain of episcopal ordination, it would make no sort of difference to my view of the grace of ordination. Knowing, as we do, that much of the divinest work in all ages has been done by men who were neither priests nor bishops, and often in deadly antagonism to the vast majority of those who were both; and knowing also that “the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth: so is every man that is born of the Spirit,” our notes of the true church are not the Romish ones of Cardinal Bellarmine, but rather those of Pearson and Field and Hooker and the Reformers and the Articles of the Church of England. And while all of these more or less accepted and valued episco-

pacy, none of them insisted on it as an indispensable and essential requisite for true membership of the church of Christ.

Having spoken thus plainly, I may add without suspicion that I regard the episcopal government of churches as very ancient; as having been in some churches primitive; as being in entire accordance with the example of the Apostles; as being, with all its necessary and serious imperfections, the best and wisest form of church organization in most churches, and, apart from overwhelming difficulties, in *all* churches. With our most learned Elizabethan divines, I hold that episcopacy is lawful in its use and primitive in its origin; but I do not maintain for it any indefeasible divine prescription, nor do I regard the bishop as being of an essentially different order from the presbyter, but only as a president among presbyters, endowed with one or two special functions, and with a limited, but neither absolute nor infallible, authority. No one with the least pretence to honesty can any longer deny that in the New Testament "bishop" and "presbyter" are *interchangeable*, though not always or necessarily *identical*, terms; and that the Apostles St. Peter and St. John are quite content to call themselves "presbyters." In the church of Ephesus the same men (Acts xx., 17, 28) are called "bishops" and "presbyters." Paul and Barnabas ordained "presbyters" in their churches. In the church of Philippi we are only told of "bishops" and deacons; and the "presbyters" whom Titus is told to ordain are also called "bishops." The assumption that Christ founded an episcopal organization during "the great forty days" is a mere hypothesis destitute of the shade of a shadow of proof. The church ought to say quite as clearly as Sir Isaac Newton, "*Hypotheses non fingo*." Bishops are unknown to the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" and to the "Epistle of Barnabas." In St. Clement of Rome "bishops" and presbyters are still interchangeable terms. Ignatius exalts episcopacy in language which would be both unscriptural and extravagant unless it were regarded as being of local and temporary significance; yet he knows nothing of diocesan bishops, nothing of irresponsible and independent bishops, and does not represent bishops as either instituted by the Apostles or as successors of the Apostles. Ignatius writes to the church of Rome without even alluding to any bishop of Rome, any more than St. Paul does in his Epistle to the Romans. St. Polycarp and St. Clement write to the churches of

Philippi and Corinth, and say nothing of the existence of any presiding bishop in those churches. Everything points to the conclusion of St. Jerome that episcopacy did not arise from any *dominica dispositio*, but rather *consuetudine ecclesiæ*.

Yet the positions of St. James at Jerusalem, of Timothy at Ephesus of Titus in Crete, and perhaps of the "Angels" of the seven churches in Asia, offer a sufficient analogy to episcopal government to enable us to say, without the aid of effeminate and fantastic fictions, that episcopacy may claim apostolic sanction. And that sanction is more than sufficiently confirmed by the almost immemorial practice of the church. The church which may in all serious matters claim the living presence and continual guidance of the spirit of God neither needs to invent dubious revelations, nor to manufacture disputable history, nor to place herself at the mercy of archæologists, nor to depend on

"Critics who dissect the sacred page
Till God's gifts hang on grammar, and the saint
Is weaker than the sage."

For her maintenance of episcopacy it is sufficient that she can claim the highest antiquity and the sacred wisdom learnt from continuous experience, as well as adequate analogies from the history of the Apostolic church.

And without urging any other reasons "Why I am an Episcopalian," I should feel it enough to say that the episcopal form of church organization, while it is most in accordance with that which has been all but universally adopted since the age of the Apostles, is also best adapted for the peace, order, and progress of the church's work.

One principle on which we rest the benefit of episcopacy was laid down by Homer many centuries ago. It is *οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίῃ· εἰς κοίρανος ἔστω*. "Lords many" are an evil in any community, and the church early discovered that the limited independence of one presiding authority was her best bulwark alike against the prevalence of internal schism and the attacks of external heretics. Institutions, like men, must always have "the defects of their qualities," and there was never an age in which prelates might not be tempted to be inflated and violent, worldly and luxurious, tyrannical and unjust. But these dangers may equally occur in any other form of ecclesiastical polity, and in presbyteries also there may be a domineering Diotrophes or an heretical Hymenæus. It may, I think, be laid down as a gen-

eral rule, without fear of contradiction, that, other things being equal, a church will gain by episcopal organization in unity, in vigor, in progressiveness, in power of discipline, and in purity of doctrine. I would point to two conspicuous illustrations—the church of America and the episcopate in the British Colonies.

As regards the church of America, I am told that alone, or almost alone, of the religious communities on the western continent, it is steadily, if but slowly, adding to its numbers, lengthening its cords, and strengthening its stakes. No one, I think, can fail to see that, in the history of that church, the consecrations of Bishop Seabury by two Scotch bishops at Aberdeen, in 1784, and of Bishop White by Archbishop Moore at Lambeth, in 1787, are epoch-making events. Bishop Seabury was a moderate High-Churchman, and Bishop White a Broad-Churchman of the school of Tillotson; but the vigorous understanding of the former and the large-hearted wisdom of the latter, during his forty-years' episcopate, gave an impulse to the Episcopal Church in America which it could hardly have received had they been nothing but leading presbyters. As to the colonial episcopate of England, the number of bishops in the last century has increased from one to seventy-five. Is it but a hundred years ago since Dr. Charles Inglis was consecrated Bishop of Nova Scotia, and now there is no single colony or dependency of Great Britain, of any size or importance, which is not under special episcopal supervision. No one acquainted with the facts will deny that these bishops, *as bishops*, and in virtue of the authority thus specially conferred upon them, have powerfully aided the preservation of the faith, and given an incomparable impetus to the evangelization of the world.

And if proof be required of the blessedness of an episcopal organization in the church of Christ, may we not appeal to the long annals of eighteen hundred years? Was it not found, even in the second century, that episcopacy was the great centre of unity, the great safeguard of faithfulness, the great bulwark against heresy? In those early days of Christianity how many of the martyrs were bishops! How often—as in the see of Rome, where, of the first thirty bishops, it is said that all but two were martyred—did that humble spiritual preëminence mean only the prerogative of death! What might not have become of the seed-

* The writer here ventures to repeat a few words used in a sermon in Westminster Abbey at the consecration of the Bishop of Tasmania.

ling of the faith in the second and third centuries had there been no St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, to face the wild beasts in the Colosseum; no St. Polycarp, Bishop of Lyons, to brave the flame in the amphitheatre of Smyrna; no St. Cyprian, to bend his noble head to the flashing axe at Carthage! Think of the noble simplicity, combined with powerful eloquence and deep learning, of St. Gregory of Nazianzus and St. Gregory of Nyssa in the fourth century; of how St. Chrysostom carried to the throne of a patriarch the asceticism of a hermit; of how St. Augustine, declining to wear the splendid vestments which were given him, sold them to give to the poor; of how St. Basil and St. Ambrose, St. Martin and St. Hilary, stood before kings and were not ashamed. Think how in the fifth and sixth centuries the bishops were the true and almost the sole defenders of the state. Think how Attila the Hun recoiled before the unarmed majesty of St. Leo; how Odovakar was overawed by St. Severinus; how Theodoric the Ostrogoth was softened by respect for St. Epiphanius; how the brave Totila was impressed by the holiness of St. Benedict. Then think of the bishop-missionaries—of St. Boniface, the apostle of Germany; of St. Augustine of Canterbury; of Bishop Otho of Pomerania. Why need I continue the story, as I might do from age to age, of all those saintly prelates whose brows have been mitred with Pentecostal flame? Why need I pause to mention such holy and humble men of heart as Bishop Bedell and Bishop Ken amid the moral waste of the seventeenth century? or what need is there to point to the sweet and saintly figures of Bishop Thomas Wilson and of Bishop Berkeley, to whom the satirist attributed “every virtue under heaven,” during the torpor of the eighteenth century? Is it not enough to show that during all these centuries Wisdom has been justified of her children, and that in our age also they have maintained their spiritual nobleness?

And not only at home, but no less in foreign lands the humble bishops have placed themselves in the very fore-front of toil and peril, and have done a work which it is only possible for bishops to achieve. We think of India, and we recall the fair spirit of Reginald Heber, the quiet wisdom of George Cotton; of Newfoundland, and we recall the apostolic labors of Bishop Field for thirty-five years; of New Zealand, and the image of Selwyn seems to rise before us; of Sierra Leone, and we know how three English bishops died there in seven years, each stepping where his prede-

cessor had fallen. Nor have they all passed away to join the more in number. How many a true servant of Jesus Christ, how many a brave and self-denying standard-bearer of the cross, did we see when the bishops of the Lambeth Conference met last summer in Westminster Abbey! We saw that saintly and beloved old man, the Bishop of Minnesota, who has won the proud title once borne by the lion-hearted missionary, John Eliot, of "the Apostle of the Indians"; we saw the calm and wise bishop who, from his home in the stormy Falkland Isles, has charge of many a scattered congregation through all the vast regions of South America; we saw the bishop of another race, once a slave boy, once bartered for a horse, twice for rum and tobacco; his spirit then so broken that he tried to commit suicide; sold to Portuguese traders, rescued by an English vessel, converted, educated, meeting and converting his parents after twenty-five long years,—the first negro bishop whom the world has seen. And among the prelates of England and Australia and the West Indies and America, there was one—the Bishop of Moosoonie—who has planted the Rose of Sharon in the sub-Arctic wastes, and through whose blessed ministrations the word of the Gospel of Peace has come to many a poor Indian tribe, once degraded and cannibal, in their wigwams on the bleak shores of Hudson's Bay.

Yes, and more even than this. If the blood of martyrs be the seed of the church, is it nothing that, even in a century of such luxury and such materialism as this, we have seen the aureole of martyrdom shining softly round the brows of bishops whom we have known? In the last twenty-two years no less than three such martyrs have been taken from the ranks of the colonial episcopate. In 1862 a dying man, ministering to the dead under an acacia-tree in feverous swamps of Africa, read as much as he could of the burial service, in the deepening gloom of a tropical twilight, over the body of Bishop Charles Mackenzie. That martyr had died, but thirteen months after his consecration, delirious, fever-stricken, on the malarious banks of the River Shire. In 1870, floating, under the burning sunlight, over the blue waves of the Pacific tide, a boat bore from the shores of Nukapu the lifeless body of Bishop Coleridge Patteson, stabbed with five wounds, the knotted palm-branch on his breast, a smile as of heaven upon the pallid lips. In 1885 died in Equatorial Africa a young man in the prime of life and strength, full of fun, full of

vigor, full of high spirits. He had given up home and all its wealth and happiness to be a messenger of heaven through those dreary and horrible regions. He had been often lost in the jungle; often starving; stung by swarms of bees; in constant peril of wild beasts; advancing alone and unarmed to face men whose venomous arrows were poised and trembling upon the string, ready in an instant to smite him with a death of agony; in the midst of savages brutal and revolting; holding not his life dear unto himself, and all for the love of Christ. Yet "so full was my trust in Christ that I laughed amid the very agony of my situation." I have had in my own hands the little *Churchman's Almanack* in which the young martyr wrote his last words from day to day. On October 29 he wrote: "I can hear no news, but I was held up by the 30th Psalm, which came to me with great power. A hyena howled near me last night, smelling the sick man, but I hope he is not to have me yet." The ink was scarcely dry on those last words when, singing hymns, he was led out of the filthy hut in which he had been imprisoned, to die for his Master's sake. Yes, thank God, even the life of this nineteenth century has been redeemed and ennobled by the imperial purple of martyrdom. "We still ring true," says a great writer, "when anything strikes home to us, and though the idea that everything should pay has infected our every purpose, there is still a capacity of noble passion left in the heart's core of Englishmen, and there is hope for the nation while this can be said of it."

Such in age after age, has been the episcopate, and above all that which corresponds most nearly in its conditions to our episcopate in the colonies. Nor can God have given it a nobler mark of his blessing than in putting into the happy hands of so many bishops the palm of martyrdom.

Against other forms of ecclesiastical organization I have nothing to say, but I cannot agree with Pope in the view that

"That which is best administered is best."

If we are to choose the form which, apart from exceptional circumstances, is ideally and absolutely the best, I believe that form to be episcopacy. I am an Episcopalian because I believe that the church acted under the guidance of the Spirit of God in early and finally adopting the rule of bishops as a rule which would best promote the advancement of the kingdom of Christ and the integrity of the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

F. W. FARRAR.

THE VALUE OF INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS.

BY THE HON. JOSEPH R. HAWLEY, UNITED STATES SENATOR
FROM CONNECTICUT.

THE United States is about to hold another international exhibition. Several times, in varied forms and different places, the proposition has been made and has met ineffectual responses. But now it seems to have passed the stages of "suppose" and "why not?" and become a definite purpose. The city of New York is to take the lead. Its press has spoken vigorously, and a great number of its prominent citizens, for themselves individually, or in behalf of organized interests, have signified their hearty approval and promised their labors.

New York is able, and it is a good work at a good time. In 1892 sixteen years will have elapsed since the Centennial Exhibition—a time sufficiently long to make it useful and pleasant to measure again our progress in comparison with older nations. In 1876 our population was about forty-five millions; in 1892 it will be sixty-nine or seventy millions—a growth of nearly 55 per cent. in numbers and more than that in wealth and power. The world has gained in science, invention, and art, in skill and productive power, in an accelerated ratio from year to year. The international exhibition has justified itself as an institution by its fruits, and it will undoubtedly continue to appear. The intervals must be regulated by the business world's public opinion, but a too frequent recurrence would be checked by the unwillingness of exhibitors. They are the real supporters of exhibitions; their investments and expenditures are heavy and voluntary; they cannot be coerced. France is this year conducting a splendid affair, but, by reason of its political significance, it fails to reach a full international character. We hear of no purpose to invite an exhibition in 1890 or 1891; so 1892 is a fit time, and the nations will be likely to respond cheerfully. The United States is a vigorous competitor and a rich customer.

It is at peace with the world, and desires to continue so. This is neutral ground, where all will meet a generous welcome from us, and where they can greet each other with more frankness and sincerity than at home, in close view of their tremendous preparations for killing one another at instant notice.

We have said that international exhibitions have justified themselves. It is not too much to say that each has cultivated the taste and modified the industries of the nation holding it. Scott Russell, the famous English engineer, writing in 1886, said :

"The last eighteen years have seen a series of events slowly, regularly, and disagreeably awakening the [British] nation from a pleasant belief, once a reality, now a dream. Eighteen years ago there began a series of competitive trials of intelligence and skill between the citizens of the civilized nations of the world. Adam Smith's views of the wealth of nations were to be put to the new trial of competitive examination."

The exhibition of 1851—the Crystal Palace—was a brilliant surprise for the world, but in size and fulness of representation it would to-day be regarded as an exceedingly unsatisfactory attempt.

"In that great school," said Russell, "the nations of Europe learned their first lessons in technical education. They were able to see in how many things England retained her hereditary excellence, and in how many branches of taste and skill other nations possessed qualities in which she was wanting."

This was England's first lesson: her second was at Paris in 1855. "Nothing," said Russell, "was more striking than the enormous progress nations had made from their first lesson." In each group of skill and invention some had taken heed and made advances. "England had been struck by the amazing superiority of some Continental nations in the beauty and grace of design," which sufficed to convert clay and flint "into valuable and invaluable works of art in earthenware and glass." He details the remarkable efforts of England to educate her artisans during the intervening four years. The best models by the best masters were distributed; schools of design were established for the potteries and glass-works; teachers for art workmen were trained. England was disgusted with the old blue ware of China and thereafter used it only "to export to barbarous countries." In 1851 France felt her inferiority in manufactures of iron and steel, and by 1855 had made great improvements. England thought it a mere spurt for the exhibition till in the exhibition of 1862 she found it genuine. America sent there "some of her exquisite

machinery for economizing labor," and all around the people were crowding England. The exhibition of 1867, Russell says, "rudely awakened and thoroughly alarmed" England. France surpassed her in steam-engines at sea and on land; also in iron armor and iron for railway forms, buildings, and ship-frames. One of the best things done for England was by the Society of Arts, which sent over fifty-five selected workmen to study their respective trades, whose written reports made an exceedingly instructive volume of 689 pages.

In all these exhibitions the United States appeared, always complaining of the insufficiency of her representation, but always winning much praise and many prizes. In 1851 we had less than 700 exhibitors, but the London *Times* said the American department was second in interest. Colt's pistols, then a novelty abroad; McCormick's reaper, which was deemed a miracle; Powers's Greek Slave, the most heartily-lauded and best-remembered statue in the exhibition, represent classes in which America won honor. The older generation of American mechanics remember their delight when Hobbs opened Bramah's lock in two days, afterward opening and closing it at pleasure, winning a prize of two hundred guineas; and he proceeded to open Chubb's lock in twenty-five minutes for another prize. And every year we hear how we won and keep the cup that Steers's yacht "America" captured when she came in "ahead, with the rest nowhere." Concerning the Vienna exhibition of 1874, it was an Englishman who said: "America seems to defy all Europe to cope with her, run with her, or overtake her. She has the champion display of implements, tools, and machinery."

But while thus appearing everywhere and winning much honor, chiefly for our mechanics, it was not until 1876 that we appeared to take to heart practically the lessons Great Britain began to learn in 1851 and 1855, concerning grace and beauty in form and color, and the necessity of technical education for all connected with industrial pursuits. We found that we remained ahead in inventive skill and genius in a variety of fields, notably in all manner of tools for the shop, labor-saving devices for the kitchen, machines for the farm, and machines and machine tools for the factory. And it is true that in these and a wide variety of other things we used less matter to obtain a given quantity of work, and built with finer lines and less clumsiness, than the foreigners.

But the exhibition had not closed before our potteries changed their forms and struggled for grace, finish, and decoration to meet a more refined and elevated popular demand. In like manner we changed our taste in glass-ware and plated ware, in gold and silver work, in paper hangings, in furniture of all kinds, in curtains and carpets, and all manner of interior decoration, and particularly in domestic architecture. In the latter respect, in a thousand villages and cities the word "Centennial" might be stamped as a trade-mark upon a multitude of houses. The popular taste in engravings, etchings, paintings, and sculpture advanced, and the supply hurried to meet it.

If we did not carry from town to town casts and models and patterns, and provide schools and trained teachers of design, it was because we are not, as a people, so utterly dependent upon foreign trade in our manufactures as Great Britain and France are; because of the subdivision of power between States and the nation; and, lastly, because, even in matters over which the States have exclusive and unlimited jurisdiction, we entertain prejudices against some manifestations of the paternal theory of government. But the longing for art education has brought about some satisfactions. It is a delight to many to see Americans like Tiffany & Co. enter the field at Paris in 1878 and 1889 with forms, designs, colors, and workmanship wholly from American hands and heads, and win triumphs as decisive as that of the yacht "America." It is not enough to tell the manufacturer how to observe true art: the sure way to reach him is through an improved popular taste, which will direct him in search of beauty.

The English, with vast quantities of excellent machinery, did not exhibit largely at Philadelphia, partly because they foresaw no market here for such goods, and partly because they had in many things borrowed from us. As an example: an enterprising iron-manufacturer told the writer that he went by invitation from a meeting of the British Iron and Steel Association to visit an English rail-mill of high rank. He found there in operation the Danks puddler, invented by Samuel Danks, of Cincinnati; the "three-high" rail train, invented by John Fritz, of Bethlehem, Penn.; the Winslow squeezer, invented by Mr. Winslow, of Troy; Blake's crusher, invented by Mr. Blake, of New Haven; the Corliss engine, invented by George H. Corliss, of Rhode Island, and Root's blower, invented by Mr. Root, of Connorsville, Penn.

While every nation usually thinks that it knows what its own products and capacities are, it learns from an exhibition more about itself than about anybody else, and, while it may fortify its reasons for a just pride in some things, its vanity is likely to be a little dimmed. Before 1876 a very large number of Americans were inclined to say hastily that we had nothing specially interesting to exhibit; but afterward they were satisfied that, while it was evidently a country very interesting to other nations, and a leader in some material things, it had a great deal to learn.

A purely national exhibition is practically an impossibility. It would be exceedingly difficult to exclude all articles produced or manufactured elsewhere. The profit lies in comparisons with the works of peoples of older, or otherwise different, civilizations, of various climates, soils, traditions, habits, and processes; and that profit is in geometric ratio to the degree in which the comparison approaches universality.

Evidently there is a general drift toward the opinion that New York is the best place for the exhibition. It is the great commercial metropolis. Hither tend all railways. The water communication, along so many thousands of miles of coast-line, is a great advantage. Were it intended to be an exclusively national exhibition, the argument for Cincinnati or Chicago or St. Louis would be stronger. But as we greatly desire as large a measure as possible of foreign participation, it is wise to select New York, as near the centre of all the exhibiting populations as possible. Since 1876 the comfort, convenience, safety, and rapidity of ocean travel, and the economy of transportation, have gained so much that we may justly expect a larger exhibit of goods than before, and a very much greater number of visitors.

The climate of New York is largely in its favor. The intense heat of midsummer is greatly tempered by the river and the ocean. This consideration weighs heavily against Washington. But there are other and even stronger arguments against that city. Its libraries, museums, scientific collections, the number of scientific bureaus and of learned and zealous specialists, are rapidly increasing. It is fast growing to be the one city above all others fit to be the chief university city of a great nation. But its population is only about 200,000. Its people have not the accumulations of wealth to be found in a city of bankers, merchants, and manufacturers. Held in Washington, the exhibition

would be helplessly dependent on the government for practically every dollar needed. The Congress will undertake no such task.

Both for profit and instruction the greatest possible number of visitors is desirable. All great and even measurably successful exhibitions have been held in large cities. Most of the adult residents of London, Paris, Vienna, and Philadelphia, and of the vicinity within an hour's travel, visited the exhibitions in those places, and many of them many times. The number who come from a great distance is usually exaggerated in estimates. They are valuable visitors, because they come to learn, and carry back and diffuse their knowledge. But they do not supply most of the receipts. Baltimore is the only considerable city within easy reach of Washington. Including all Maryland and fractions of Delaware and Virginia and some of the nearer counties of Pennsylvania, it is doubtful if there are 1,400,000 people within two or three hours' travel of Washington, possibly increasing by 1892 to 1,700,000. A goodly fraction of these are poor colored people.

On the other hand, New York in a similar and fair calculation of the number who could leave home, spend six hours at an exhibition, and reach home that evening, can count about five millions in 1880 and nearly seven millions in 1892. Her extraordinary water and land communication is not to be compared with Washington's.

Among the schemes is one proposing to make the exhibition permanent. There is always a temptation to play with the stick of the rocket after it has performed its function. An exhibition is mostly a collection of what civilization has to show for itself to-day. It is not an ethnological or other museum, exhibiting the conditions and progress of the various races in successive ages; it is a flash photograph of civilization on the run. In its second year its exhibits will mostly be antiquated, its farm products mouldy, its textiles faded and dusty, its metals rusty, its designs out of fashion. From it a few articles might be selected for a museum and paid for. It is the exhibitors who bear the burden. They own their goods and pay for the care of them. When the last day arrives, they take them home. When the doors are closed, the best substitute for the exhibition proper is to be found in the windows of the shopping streets of great cities and in machine-shops, factories, railways, iron-mills, and steamships. A good collection of last year's birds' nests would be

valuable in a naturalist's museum ten years hence ; but a "permanent" exhibition of babies would need constant renewal. Attempts at maintaining the permanency of exhibitions have all failed.

The propositions to establish a permanent exhibition, or another museum, at Washington, betray lamentable ignorance of what is already there. In 1846, upon the establishment of the Smithsonian Institution "for the diffusion of knowledge among mankind," Congress placed in its charge all objects of natural history, mineralogy, geology, and all antiquities belonging to the United States. The Wilkes collection went to the Smithsonian in 1856 and became the nucleus around which gathered objects preserved for educational purposes. All our scientific explorations and expeditions, the free gifts of our navy and merchant marine and of collectors of many kinds, the gift by twenty-five exhibiting nations, at the close of the Centennial, of a great collection of objects natural and manufactured, occasional purchases, the labors of the Smithsonian corps, directed by unbounded zeal and the highest scientific knowledge, —these and other sources have heaped up an immense collection of valuable objects illustrating the widest range of studies, until the capacity of the new museum and all other buildings under control for storage even are exhausted. Give the managers room, and there will become visible within ten years a museum unequalled in the world.

In such an institution no class or object comes into competition with any other. It is a collection of object-lessons, or, as Professor Huxley styles it, "a consultative library of objects." There is nothing in the whole scheme of our government which qualified critics at home and abroad commend more highly than its scientific men and their works, and the future of the great national museum is well assured.

Let us, then, direct our effort toward a true international exhibition—a presentation as well-proportioned and balanced as possible of "the natural resources of the country and their development, and of its progress in those arts which benefit mankind, in comparison with those of older nations," and promote and invite a like participation elsewhere.

This article is not intended to offer advice or suggestions. But governmental action concerning the exhibition of 1876 was so peculiar that a reference to it may be instructive. It was a suc-

cession of acts rendered necessary by the imperfect grasp of the first, and by various unforeseen circumstances, chiefly the financial depression of 1874. The original act created a commission from each State and Territory, with power to superintend a plan for an exhibition and with exclusive control thereof, but neither appropriated money nor gave directions concerning the methods of getting it. Wherefore the commission obtained from Congress another act creating a "Centennial Board of Finance," a joint stock corporation authorized to raise, receive, and disburse moneys, erect buildings, etc. This double-headed organization well answered the emergency.

Foreign nations will not send commissioners to or take official notice of an exhibition without official national invitation. The national government is compelled to assume responsibility for the enterprise, and naturally desires a measure of general control over the chief features concerning both our own citizens and the foreigners. It would seem best that there should be a business corporation distinct from the legislative supervisory organization, and that it also might as well be created by Congress. The stock of that would be held chiefly in the locality of the exhibition. In the probable case now before us, citizens of New York would conduct that organization. Managed purely as a speculative, money-making affair, it would desire, perhaps, to follow the example of other speculative organizations—charge exhibitors for the space they took, and not only sell concessions and exact royalties, but permit encysted exhibitions within the area of the main exhibition, like the familiar "side-shows" of the circus, and take toll of them. The Centennial Exhibition did nothing of the kind. For the fifty cents paid at the gate the citizen was entitled to see all within the walls. Whatever space could be spared to an exhibitor he occupied without fee or toll. Sales were taxed and concessions sold, but there was no involuntary taxation of the admitted public.

That these just regulations might be carried out, and because the work will be a national benefit, it would be equitable that the national government should contribute a reasonable, but generous, sum. It is quite possible to devise a wise method of national protection, regulation, and assistance, by a small national commission, with popular support and investment and chiefly local administration.

A reasonable time having elapsed since the previous exhibition, and the requisite local enthusiasm, capital, energy, and patriotism being apparently ready, every man who has studied these great enterprises will give this his hearty good-will. It will promote harmony and fraternity among our own States; it will stimulate progress in the sciences and arts that benefit mankind; it will invite trade, and strengthen the bonds of peace and amity among nations.

Dr. Whewell entitles the first English exhibition "The University of 1851." Humboldt said: "Those states which take no part in the general industrial movement will infallibly see their prosperity diminish." Secretary Seward said: "From the commencement of the industrial epoch of 1851, the profound significance and value of such exhibitions have been realized by the people and governments of the civilized nations. Their beneficent influences are many and widespread. They advance human knowledge in all directions. Through the universal language of the products of labor, the artisans of all countries hold communication; ancient prejudices are broken down; nations are fraternized; generous rivalries in the peaceful fields of industry are excited; the tendencies to war are lessened, and a better understanding between labor and capital is fostered." And Mr. Whitier sang in 1876:

"Thou who hast here in concord furled
The war flags of a gathered world,
Beneath our Western skies fulfil
The Orient's mission of good-will,
And, freighted with Love's golden fleece,
Send back the Argonauts of peace.

"Oh! make Thou us, through centuries long,
In peace secure, and justice strong;
Around our gift of freedom draw
The safeguards of Thy righteous law,
And, cast in some diviner mould,
Let the new cycle shame the old!"

J. R. HAWLEY.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BY ELECTRICITY.

BY ELBRIDGE T. GERRY.

THE PENALTY of death for the commission of crime had its origin in the mandate uttered by the Creator after the world had witnessed the first murder. The divine authority to terminate human life for the illegal shedding of blood, enlarged by the subsequent enunciation of the law from Mount Sinai in its application to other offences, appears to have been exercised ever since by every nation on the earth, barbarous as well as civilized, in some form or other, in punishment of offences more or less heinous in their character. Under the Mosaic code there were no less than thirty-three capital crimes, and the mode of execution, that by stoning to death, made the people themselves the instruments for its infliction. For a long period human ingenuity exhausted itself in efforts to devise means of death by which the latter should only be the final result of prolonged physical pain and agony. The vengeance of the law, as it was popularly termed, was sought to be made as terrible as possible, first in retaliation for the crime committed, and, secondly, in order to produce, by the horrible tortures which it inflicted, a deterrent effect, in the language of the old law-books, on other evilly-minded persons disposed in like manner to offend. The sickening details still preserved of executions by impalement, sawing asunder, boiling, burning, and flaying alive, crushing by weights, breaking on the wheel, tearing asunder by wild horses, and the like, create a doubt in the mind of the student of history, especially of the law, whether such punishments, so far from deterring, did not both suggest and stimulate the commission of the very crimes they were designed to prevent.

Certainly the multiplication of capital offences in England had the result of increasing their commission, and later, as civilization advanced and the subject became more carefully studied, fewer

crimes were made capital and less formidable methods of inflicting the death penalty were adopted. The deprivation of life is now almost universally regarded as a full and complete satisfaction of what is commonly styled the outraged majesty of the law, and the methods employed to-day are undoubtedly intended to deprive the criminal of his life without subjecting him to additional physical pain or suffering as a prelude to that result. The spirit of humanity which everywhere asserts itself as civilization advances has, in other words, decreed that some mercy shall be shown even the vilest convict in depriving him of life, and that the means employed to accomplish that end shall be as rapid and painless as possible. For the average criminal dreads death itself far more than the mode of its infliction. Its ignominy is seldom thought of. Loss of life signifies to him a permanent deprivation of every pleasure, and this, coupled with a lively dread of the terrors of the world to come, overshadows the fear of the machinery of the law which accomplishes the result. Up to the last moment condemned criminals often brace themselves to apparent stoicism ; but at the fatal instant few fail to show evidences of the terror with which they meet their doom. Hence any prolongation of the death agony, either as a deterrent or as a part of the punishment, is alike unnecessary and cruel. The mental anguish far exceeds the physical pain.

Modern Europe has practically reduced the modes of inflicting the death penalty, so far as the criminal law is concerned, to beheading and strangulation—beheading, by the sword and guillotine ; strangulation, by the garrote and hanging. Beheading is a method of execution alike certain and instantaneous, but it is necessarily followed by the effusion of blood, and is open to many objections unnecessary here to enumerate. Strangulation by the garrote, accompanied as it is by the simultaneous crushing of the spinal column at the neck, while certain and instantaneous, is only resorted to in Spain and her colonies, and produces a ghastly mutilation of the body. Strangulation by hanging has been practised in England and this country for very many years, our colonies having inherited it from the mother-country as the recognized form of capital execution. The sentence is that the convict be hanged by the neck until he is dead. But careful examination of this mode of execution satisfied a commission appointed by the Legislature of the State of New York in 1886 to

consider the subject that the time and mode of death by this method were alike uncertain and dependent partly on the nerve of the convict and partly on the skill of the executioner ; that in some cases the neck was broken by a sudden jerk, and in others protracted agonies of strangulation ensued ; and that there was no certainty in any case of either result following the cutting loose of the weight or the fall of the drop.

To render this more intelligible the following description will suffice : The convict is placed under a frame, in the centre of which hangs a rope carried over pulleys to an adjoining apartment. There the end of the rope is attached to a mass of metal double the actual weight of the convict's body, and suspended some four or five feet from the ground by a guard rope ready to be severed at the instant of the execution. Then a running noose through an enormous knot of the size of the fist is adjusted around the neck of the convict so that the knot comes under the left ear. The end of the noose rope running through the knot is attached by a snap hook to the rope on the frame, the guard rope is cut on signal given, the metal weight falls, and the convict is suddenly and violently jerked into the air. Now, if the knot is accurately adjusted, and the man stands motionless, this sudden jerk dislocates the spinal column at the neck and death is instantaneous. He dies, in other words, from a broken neck. But if the knot is not exactly in the right place, if the convict, through accident, fear, or attempted resistance, turns his head, or the knot changes its position, then death by slow strangulation ensues, the struggles lasting from eighteen to twenty minutes and being horrible to witness. Where a drop through a platform is substituted for the frame, weight, and pulleys, the result is the same—a notable illustration of it occurring in the execution of the Chicago Anarchists in 1887.

As recently as July 31, 1889, two men, Henry Smart and Charles Dilger, were hanged in Louisville, Kentucky, for murder. The knot was properly adjusted in Smart's case, and his death was sudden and instantaneous. Not so with Dilger. At the time of drop the end of the rope forming the noose was seen to unravel, and the noose refused to tighten. The knot so far untied as to be held in its place only by a single coil, and the rope was caught directly under the point of the man's chin. It was obvious to any spectator that death would

not result inside of several hours unless something were done, and the struggling attempts of the unfortunate man to breathe could be heard distinctly over the entire yard. An eye-witness of the horrible sight describes the noise as sharp and rasping—so peculiar as to render it impossible of description. Finally two of the officers lifted the body, and another rope was quickly made fast to the cross-beam overhead. Dilger was dazed, and muttered incoherently. At the second drop the new rope also seemed reluctant, and the knot slipped around to the back of Dilger's neck. The noose tightened, however, and *after twenty-four minutes, during which the body writhed and twisted*, Dilger was pronounced dead ! In addition to this the numerous recorded cases of broken ropes, decapitation by the use of too small a noose cord, prolonged suffering from peculiar physical development of the neck, as also some authentic cases of subsequent resuscitation, demonstrate very plainly the propriety of substituting, if practicable, some means of inflicting the death penalty which shall be painless, instantaneous, and uniform in its results.

Of all the potent forces capable of producing death, there is none known to science more nearly instantaneous than electricity. In the ordinary occurrence in nature, where a person struck by lightning falls dead, nothing can be more sudden or rapid. And where—to give what has already proved to be a practical and fatal illustration—electricity is generated artificially for illuminating purposes, the interruption of the current by the intervention of or contact with any portion of the human body is invariably followed by the most serious consequences to the latter. Over ninety cases of accidental death by such contacts during the past two years are recorded, and in every case the action of the current was so instantaneous as to leave not the shadow of a doubt that death was literally quicker than thought. The body was not mutilated ; there were no indications of any death-struggle ; none of physical pain. The Constitution of the State of New York (Article I., § 5) wisely prohibits the infliction of “cruel *and* unusual punishments.” Hanging, for the reasons shown, while not unusual, may be, and too often is, cruel. Electricity, on the other hand, while not yet usual, has yet to be proven to be cruel ; and as death whenever produced by it has been instantaneous, it is difficult to see how it can be shown to be cruel. That burns and injuries do result from contact with the electric current does

not disprove its instantaneous lethal power. It might as well be argued that a deadly drug like strychnia is harmless because a slight dose is productive of only unpleasant results. Even electricity in a mild form is a valuable medical agent.

It is neither the purpose nor intention of the writer of this article to discuss or examine the special methods by which the electrical current may or should be utilized in its application to insure death. The Legislature of this State in 1888 amended its Code of Criminal Procedure by substituting for the death penalty of hanging the "causing to pass through the body of the convict a current of electricity of sufficient intensity to cause death, and the application of such current must be continued until such convict is dead." The selection of the apparatus for the purpose is wisely entrusted by law to the superintendent of State-prisons. What particular kind of current or *electrolethe*—to coin a word expressive of the apparatus—is the most efficacious is a question properly within his province to determine, and comes within the sphere of the skilful practical electricians selected by him to provide the same. But that a current of electricity of sufficient intensity, purposely and directly applied to the human body, will certainly and instantaneously destroy life, is demonstrated by the ninety cases of accidental death by electricity where no such application was intended; where, on the contrary, the current was generated and guarded as far as practicable for a different purpose, but where the death could not be ascribed to any other cause. That a number of other persons may have escaped with severe injuries at other times and under other circumstances simply argues an imperfect contact with the current. But to contend that a proper *electrolethe* cannot be constructed, certain in its effects, when such fatal accidental results from an ordinary arc-light dynamo, intended only for illuminating purposes, are proven beyond dispute, is simply to argue an absurdity.

ELBRIDGE T. GERRY.

THE TRANSFORMATION OF PARIS.

BY FREDERIC HARRISON.

No city of the Old World has undergone changes so enormous within the last hundred years as the city of Paris. To contrast its condition down to the year 1789 with its condition to-day is to measure the civilization of old Europe by the civilization of the Europe we see. Paris in 1789 was a perfect type of the feudal, monarchic, obsolete system of privilege; the Paris of 1889 is the most republican, the most modern, the most symmetrical and complete of the cities of Europe. The hundred years have witnessed there a reorganization of social life more rapid and profound than any other which Europe has known.

If the millions who throng the boulevards, and the *Places*, the *Champ de Mars*, and the *Esplanade* of the *Invalides* could but roll back the mighty veil of time, could see that city as it stood in the closing years of the eighteenth century, they would behold a city which in all essential things was a fortress of the Middle Ages, adorned with some vast palaces and churches of the *Grand Monarque*—a city, in the main, such as Rome was until the Italian kingdom had entered and transformed it. They would see the life of the seventeenth century, in most material points, unaltered—nay, traces of the life of the sixteenth, the fifteenth, and even of the fourteenth century.

The vast, gloomy, and decayed walls of the old city still cumbered the lines of so many gay and open boulevards. Where there are now some twenty bridges across the Seine, there were then but six or seven; and on some of these could still be seen the houses and buildings which made the bridges of old Europe crowded alleys. There were few open spaces at all except in front of the *Hôtel de Ville* and at the end of the garden of the *Tuileries*. The old city of Richelieu and Mazarin—the city (to speak roughly) that lay between the *Panthéon* and the gate of *St. Denis*, and between the *Tuileries* and the *Bastille*—existed still,

and much in the condition in which Richelieu and Mazarin had known it,—crowded with narrow, crooked, picturesque streets, unpaved, uncleaned, ill-lighted, with Gothic portals and towers here and there; crowded round with houses, halls, and mansions. The island, or old *Cité*, in particular, was a dense tangle of streets, churches, and religious edifices. From north to south there ran several ancient and a few recent thoroughfares; but from east to west he who wished to pass from the *Bastille* to the *Louvre* would make his way through a net-work of tortuous lanes, where the direct route was continually interrupted by huge palaces, mediæval fortresses, or conventual enclosures.

Four great castles of feudal times still frowned over the city and bore the banner of the Old Monarchy—the *Châtelet*, the *Bastille*, the *Temple*, and the *Conciergerie*. Of these not a vestige remains except the restored simulacrum of the last. In the midst of this jumble of close and mediæval streets there were scattered many sumptuous Palladian palaces of royal, princely, or ducal founders, with fore-courts, colonnades, terraces, and enclosed gardens, stretching over acres, and dominating entire quarters in defiant, lavish, insolent pride. Here and there still towered above the modern streets a huge remnant of some castle of the fourteenth or fifteenth century, such as we may see to this day in Florence, Verona, or Rome.

And, besides these castles and palaces, the closely-packed streets were even more thickly strewn with churches, convents, and abbeys. *Notre-Dame*, *St. Eustache*, *St. Germain l'Auxerrois*, the *Hôtel de Ville*, the *Louvre*, the *Palais Royal*, and the *Palais de Justice* were hemmed in with a labyrinth of old and entangled streets. Buildings, alleys, and even churches separated the *Louvre* from the *Tuileries*, *Notre-Dame* from the *Palais de Justice*, cut off *Notre-Dame* and the *Hôtel de Ville* from the river, stood between *Palais Royal* and *Louvre*, and between the *Panthéon* and the garden of the *Luxembourg*. Where the graceful fountain of Victory now brightens one of the gayest spots in Paris, the *Place du Châtelet*, bordered with two immense theatres, colonnades, gardens, and trees, there were then the decayed remnant of the great royal fortress and a net-work of crooked and unsightly lanes.

Besides the churches, chapels, hospitals, palaces, and castles, there also stood within the circuit of the city more than two

hundred religious houses for both sexes ; abbeys, convents, nunneries and fraternities ; peopled with thousands of men and women, leading separate lives, under different vows, owning obedience to far-distant superiors, and possessing various immunities. The vast areas occupied by the abbeys of *St. Germain*, of *St. Martin*, of *St. Victor*, by the houses of the *Bernardins*, and the *Célestins*, and the *Quinze - Vingt*s, were a sensible portion of the whole area within the walls. From the then new *Place Louis XV.* to the *Bastille*, from the *Luxembourg* garden to the *Porte St. Denis*, Paris was a great fortified city of the Middle Ages, crammed with thousands of sacred buildings, Catholic and feudal institutions, and thickly studded with Italian palaces, colleges, hospitals, and offices in the proud and lavish style of Louis the Fourteenth. Poverty, squalor, uncleanness, and vice jostled the magnificence of Princes and the mouldering creations of the ages of Faith.

The difference between the Paris of 1789 and the Paris of 1889 is enormous ; but it is very far from true that the whole difference is gain. Much has been gained in convenience, health, brilliance : much has been lost in beauty, variety, and historical tradition. To the uncultured votary of amusement the whole of the change represents progress : to the artist, the antiquarian, and the sentimentalist it represents havoc, waste, and bad taste. It would be well if the tens of thousands who delight in the boulevards, gardens, and sunny bridges of to-day would now and then cast a thought upon the priceless works of art, the historical remains, and the picturesque charm which the new Paris has swept away. Churches and towers, encrusted sculptures of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, rare, inimitable, irrecoverable wonders of skill and feeling, have been swallowed up wholesale in the modern "improvements." Sixteen churches have disappeared from the *Cité* alone : four of them and ten streets have been carted away to make the site of a single hospital. Where is the abbey of *St. Victor*, of *St. Germain*, of *St. Geneviève*, and the *Cour des Comptes*, and the churches of *St. André*, *St. Jacques de la Boucherie*, *Saints Innocents*, *St. Jean*, and *St. Paul* ? Where are the turrets of Saint Louis, and Etienne Marcel, and Philip the Fair ? Where are the quaint passages and fantastic gables preserved for us only by Meryon, Gavarni, and Gustave Doré ?

It would be idle to regret the inevitable—more especially

when the inevitable means the rebuilding and laying-out of the most brilliant, most spacious, most symmetrical of modern cities. For us it is enough that, down to the Revolution of 1789, Paris was an intensely old-world city; and that to-day it is the type of the modern city. In the eighteenth century London had lost every trace of the fortress, of the feudal city, of subservience to king, aristocracy, or church. It had neither ramparts, nor traces of rampart, nor convents, nor proud palaces, nor royal castles in its midst. The Reformation had swept away the monasteries, the aristocracy were more than half *bourgeois* (at least whilst they lived in London), and the King was a popular country squire, who, in things essential, was governed by a liberal Parliament. The Tower was a popular show; the Mayor and Corporation were a powerful, free, and public-spirited body; the capital was being extended and beautified in the interest of those who lived in it; and, in all its main lines, the city of London was much what it is to-day. It was about one-third more populous than Paris, better paved, better lit, with a better supply of water and means of communication, and with a far superior system of administration. It was practically a modern city, even then: it was the current type of the modern city, and was regarded by all as a far more agreeable, more civilized, more splendid city than Paris. It was natural enough that, when the liberal nobles and wits of France began to visit England (as in the eighteenth century they universally did), an Anglo-mania resulted—which was one of the main causes of the Revolution.

Some of the great ornaments of Paris existed complete in 1789, but they were encumbered with narrow streets and cut off from each other. The *Louvre*, the *Tuileries*, the *Palais Royal* existed much as we have seen them, but they were all divided from each other by blocks of buildings and intricate lanes. The *Palais de Justice*, the remains of the palace of St. Louis, and *Notre-Dame* were there, but were blocked up by modern buildings. Portions of the *Luxembourg* and of the *Hôtel de Ville* were standing. The *Invalides*, the *École Militaire*, stood as we know them; the *Place de la Concorde* (then *Place de Louis XV.*) was already laid out, and the two great offices flanking the *Rue Royale* were already built.

On the other hand, the bridge now called *de la Concorde* was not open, nor was it bounded by the Hall of the *Corps Législatif*:

there was no *Arc de l'Étoile*, no *Madeleine*, no Column of *Vendôme*, no *Place de l'Opéra*, *du Châtelet*, or *de la Bastille*. The *Place du Carrousel* was blocked by buildings, and the *Rue de Rivoli*, the *Rue de la Paix*, did not exist. The *Panthéon* was not quite finished; the *Louvre* was not continued on the northern side; the site of the *Halles* was a net-work of streets; cemeteries and charnel-houses existed within the city; the quays were irregular and rude structures; the bridges were picturesque edifices of four or five different centuries, and only one-third of their present number; there were no pavements for foot-passengers, no cleansing of the streets, whilst open sewers met one at every turn. Paris in 1789 was much what Rome was in 1860—a huge, ancient, fortified city, filled with dense, squalid, populous districts, interspersed with vast open tracts in the hands of powerful nobles or great monasteries, and the whole perpetually dominated by a bigoted, selfish, and indifferent absolutism.

The population of Paris in 1789, according to the latest and best authorities, was about 640,000: in 1889 it is 2,240,000. It has thus increased exactly three and one-half times. There is nothing abnormal in this. London in the same time has doubled quite four times, and a similar rate of increase has been seen in Berlin, Vienna, St. Petersburg, Lyons, Marseilles, and Rouen. The increase of many English centres of industry, and of nearly all the American, has been vastly greater and more rapid. Still, the increase of Paris, within a hundred years, of three or four times in population and five or six times in area, is a sufficiently striking fact. In 1789 there were about one thousand streets: there are now about four thousand. There were fifteen boulevards: there are now more than one hundred. The *Invalides*, the *Luxembourg*, the *Bastille*, the line of the inner boulevards, and the *Place Vendôme* then marked the utmost limits of regular habitations; and thence the open country began. There were within the barriers immense spaces, gardens, and parks; but they were closed to the public. Paris, which is now covered with gardens, parks, plantations, and open spaces, was in 1789 singularly bare of any. The *Jardin des Plantes*, the *Jardin des Tuileries*, were royal possessions; the *Champs Elysées* and the *Palais Royal* were favorite walks. But these were almost the only accessible promenades. Of some forty places of importance which Paris now possesses, few existed in 1789, except the *Place de la Concorde*, the *Esplanade* of the *In-*

valides, the *Champ de Mars*, the *Place Vendôme*, and the *Place Royale* (now *des Vosges*). Within the circuit of the older city there was hardly a clear space, a plantation, a parterre, or a free walk, except in the *Parvis de Notre-Dame*, the *Marché des Innocents*, and the *Place de la Grève*. From the *Louvre* to the *Hôtel de Ville* there lay a labyrinth of dark and tortuous lanes, such as we may still see in the *Ghetto* of Rome or round about the Canongate at Edinburgh.

The change that has taken place is that of a dream, or a transformation in a theatre. The Revolution came, the Convention, the first Empire, the Orleans monarchy, and the third Empire—and all is new. Streets only too symmetrical, straight, and long; open spaces at the junction of all the principal streets, boulevards, avenues, gardens, fountains, have sprung by magic into the places so lately covered with labyrinthine alleys. As we stand to-day in the *Place du Carrousel*, in the *Place de l'Opéra*, *du Théâtre Français*, *du Châtelet*, *de la Bastille*, *des Innocents*, *St. Michel*, *St. Germain*, *Notre-Dame*, or *de l'Hôtel de Ville*, each radiant with imposing buildings, stately avenues, monuments, fountains, columns, and colonnades, with everything that modern architecture can devise of spacious, airy, and gay, it is hard indeed to understand how in so few years (and much of it within the memory of men still living) all this has been created over the ruins of the dense, dark, intricate streets of the last century, where lanes still followed the ramparts of Louis the Fat and Philip Augustus, where the remnants existed of *châteaux* built by mediæval seigneurs, or during the civil wars of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

The clearance has been most cruel of all in the old *Cité*, the original Paris of the earliest ages. Down to the Revolution it had a population of about 20,000, which has now almost wholly disappeared, along with the sixteen churches and the scores of streets. The ancient island—*Lutetia*—is now occupied almost solely by six enormous public buildings; and the spot, which for eighteen centuries has been busy with the hum of a city life of intense activity and movement, is now covered only by a lonely but glorious cathedral, an enormous hospital, a huge barrack, courts, offices, and official buildings. The oldest bit of Paris, the oldest bit of city in all northern Europe, now looks for the most part like a new quarter laid out on some vacant space. *Notre-Dame*, the *Sainte Chapelle*, the *Conciergerie*, have been restored and fur-

bished up till they almost might pass for modern buildings. The barrack, the hospital, the geometric streets, the open square, might do credit to Chicago. It is all very fine, imposing, spacious, and new. But a groan may be forgiven to those who can remember the mystic portals of *Notre-Dame* with the gallery of the kings, surrounded with houses which seemed to lean upon the mother-church for comfort and support, before the restorer had worked his will upon the crumbling, dark, pathetic fragments of carving, whilst the noblest façade ever raised by northern Gothic builders still looked like a great mediæval church, and not like an *objet d'art* to be gazed at in a museum.

This transformation, the most astounding that Europe can show, fills us ever anew with a profound sense of the power which for a century has animated the municipal government at Paris ; of the energy, wealth, industrial skill, artistic imagination, and scientific accomplishments which have gone to the making of it. To plough miles and miles of broad new boulevards through the most crowded lines of an ancient, populous, and busy city ; to transform a net-work of *Ghettos* into a splendid series of avenues, squares, and gardens ; to eviscerate the heart of a great capital, and to create symmetry, sunniness, convenience, gayety, and variety out of inveterate confusion, gloom, discomfort, and squalor—this impresses the mind with the visible signs of imperial might in the ruler, and inexhaustible versatility and adaptability in the governed.

It is a different thing when a Frederick plans a new city in Berlin, or when a Republic creates itself a capital in Washington. But in Paris the capital existed ; with eighteen centuries of history, with monarchic, feudal, ecclesiastical, municipal institutions by the thousand, rooted for ages in the soil, and buttressed by long epochs of prescription, privilege, law, and superstition. Not for an hour has the capital ceased to be the living heart of France ; not for a day has its own activity been interrupted, or the lives of some million or so of citizens been broken. Republic, Consulate, Empire, Monarchy, have succeeded each other in turn. Revolutions, sieges, massacres, anarchy, tyranny, parliaments, dictators, and communes have in turn had their seat in Paris, and have occupied her streets, buildings, and monuments. But under all, the transformation of old Paris into new Paris has gone on. *Bastille, Châtelet, Temple, Tuileries*, have been swept away : enormous boulevards and avenues have torn their huge gaps like

cannon-shot through ancient quarters : abbeys, churches, palaces, hospitals, convents, gardens, halls, and theatres have disappeared like unsubstantial visions, and have left not a rack behind. As the vacant spaces are cleared, new streets, theatres, halls, and squares spring up. A thousand new fancies and hundreds of new monuments take their place with inexhaustible invention. The city grows more populous, more rich, more brilliant year by year. The busy life which is silenced in the *Cité*, or by the new boulevards, avenues, and *places*, bursts forth with a louder din elsewhere. Every creation of artistic imagination, every invention of science, is instantly brought into service and adapted to modern life. And with all this whirl of change and action, Paris remains in its essence an ancient, and not a modern, city ; a very ancient city to him who knows its history, and can recall the memorials of its past. To this day, such an one can retrace her ten successive circuits, her ramparts and barriers of successive dynasties ; he can track out the spots made memorable by Julian, by Clovis, by Philip Augustus, by Francis I. and Henry IV., by Abailard, and Héloïse, and Jeanne Darc, by Dante and Descartes, by Corneille. Some two hundred streets still bear the names of saints, each recalling some convent of the Merovingian, Carolingian, or Capetian dynasty, some one of the thousands of churches, chapels, oratories, and religious houses which once filled Paris. To the historical mind, the *St. Germain*s, the *St. Thomases*, the *St. André*s, the *St. Martin*s, the *St. Victor*s, the *St. Bernard*s, which we read inscribed at the street corner, recall a series of local memorials which reach back for a thousand years. Here St. Louis stood and prayed ; here the Grand Master of the Templars was burned ; here Jeanne Darc fell desperately wounded ; here Molière died ; here Corneille lived ; here Coligny was murdered ; here Henry IV. was stabbed ; here Voltaire died, and here Camille Desmoulins opened the Revolution.

Here, as everywhere in human life, we must take the evil with the good. It is idle, peevish, retrograde, to rail at the inevitable, or to cry out for the past. There has been awful, wanton, brutal destruction ; there have been corruption and plunder ; there has been vile art, making itself the pandar to folly and lust ; there have been cruel disregard of the poor and inhuman orgies of wealth and power, in all this series of transformation scenes which Paris has seen. No man can again recall to us the exquisite fan-

cies carved on stone and on jewelled windows of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Perhaps it was better to cart them away than to furbish them anew with gewgaw restorations. But modern life in a vast city could not endure this plethora of obsolete churches and useless convents in its midst, and the friars, black, white, and gray, had to go with all their belongings. Dark alleys are delicious in etchings ; but they are the nests of disease, vice, and death. A city of two millions cannot breathe within the winding lanes which sufficed the burghers of the fourteenth century within their gloomy ramparts. Haussmann and his myrmidons may have amassed fortunes ; but the world is still searching, lantern in hand like Diogenes, for a wise, just, incorruptible municipal authority. The art which has created modern Paris is not high art, is not true art, is in many ways most meretricious art ; and in its *chef d'œuvre*, the new Opera, it has reached the pinnacle of vulgar display. But, take it all and all, Paris can show us the brightest, most inventive, and least *mesquin* street architecture which the nineteenth century can achieve, and certainly the most imperial civic organization which Europe can produce.

There is much to be said on all sides of this complex problem ; the catholic, the legitimist, the republican, the antiquarian, the artist, the poet, the socialist, the economist, even the tourist, may be listened to with sympathy in turn. Let us gnash our teeth at the tale told us by the student of old art ; let us drop a tear over the wail of the dispossessed orders ; let us linger over every fragment of the past which the historian can point out as spared in the havoc ; let us listen to the story of the dispossessed workman ; let us study the statistics of the old and the new city ; let us stroll with the *flâneur* on the boulevards ; but let us not say that it is either altogether evil or altogether good. Modern Paris is the creation of the Revolution of 1789, and, like most of the creations of that mighty and pregnant epoch, it has the soul of good in things evil ; deplorable waste and error in the midst of inevitable and indispensable reform.

A city is made to live in. Now, a serious defect in old Paris was that it was a city in which men died. Down to the Revolution of 1789, the annual deaths exceeded the annual births. Since the Revolution the births exceed the deaths. The birth-rate in Paris is low, and the death-rate is high, as compared with that of London and English towns to-day ; but the birth-rate of Paris is

now much in excess of the death-rate. The death-rate of modern Paris is little more than twice the actual death-rate of 1789, though the population is now nearly four times as great. The death-rate of old Paris was far higher than that of any actual city of western Europe, and for a parallel to it we must now go to the cities of the East. The death-rate of Paris is still high, for it is largely increased by the almost deliberate destruction of infant life. But before the Revolution, we must take it that some three or four thousand lives were annually sacrificed to insanitary conditions. The sanitary condition of Paris in the middle of the last century was, indeed, that of Cairo or Constantinople. Drinking-water taken direct from the Seine, open sewers, cemeteries, and charnel-houses in the heart of the city, infected and squalid lanes, dirt, decay, and disorder made life precarious and scattered disease wholesale. The marvel is that pestilence was ever absent.

This was no accident; nor was it due to apathy or ignorance in the people of Paris. It was a direct result of the *Old Régime*—the deliberate act of the Monarchy, the Church, and the Nobility. Its causes were political. Paris presented in herself an epitome of all the vices, follies, inhumanities, and solecisms of the Old System. Everything in it that was effete, barbarous, injurious to modern civilization; all that prerogative, privilege, superstition, and caste could do to crush a great capital, was done. No consideration of the health, comfort, or needs of the great city affected Louis XIV. or Louis XV. They and their courts lived at Versailles, given up to ambition, display, or vice. Paris and the Parisians existed to produce fine things, to give splendor to the monarchy, society to the nobility, fat benefices to the church. The meanest fraternity of friars, the most scandalous abbé, the most rapacious courtier, was of more account than the corporate officials of Paris. Vested interests, sacred foundations, privileged rights, blocked every path to reform and progress. The king's palaces, the king's fortresses, the king's institutions were inviolable, sacred, immutable. An obsolete foundation of by-gone superstition was the cause of God. And the caprice of a great noble was a high matter of state.

Old Paris consisted of dark and crooked lanes, because in the Middle Ages cities were so built. To build new streets, to plan fresh thoroughfares, would disturb some church, destroy some oratory, inconvenience some marquis, or displace some convent.

To pave streets, to make sewers, to open spaces, to remove cemeteries, to supply pure water, and to obtain fresh air would cost money, would affect privileges or invade some right. But the money of Parisians was required to pay the king's dues, not to improve Paris. All privileges were above the law, and as sacred as the Ark of the Covenant. "Rights," in the sense of privileges, came before law, before necessity, before humanity, decency, or public duty. The *salus populi* was the *infima lex*—the lowest and last consideration which authority recognized. Prescription and the will of an absolute despot—these were the sole standards of public convenience. And the result was that they made permanent and astounding accretion of public inconvenience. Something was done by Louis XIV. to add magnificence to the capital by some royal palaces, churches, and boulevards; and early in the reign of Louis XV. the spirit of social improvement, which culminated in the States-General of 1789, began to make itself felt. A few improvements were made, new streets were built on the outskirts, the cemeteries were closed, and the water-supply was reformed. From the middle of the century a series of efforts were made, and not the least by Turgot and by his father, the Provost. But before privilege and prerogative the best efforts failed. It needed a revolution to reform the city of Paris. And the Revolution has not only reformed, but transformed it with a vengeance.

The physical disorder of old Paris was merely the reflection—indeed, but a pale reflection—of the social, political, moral disorder of the *Old Régime*. The organization of the city was a chaos of competing authorities, a tangle of obsolete privileges, and a nest of scandalous abuses. Anomalous courts jostled and scrambled for jurisdiction; ancient guilds and corporations blocked every reform; atrocious injustice and inveterate corruption reigned high-handed in the name of king, noble, or church. A valuable work of great research has just appeared (June, 1889), under the direction of an important commission of historians, which throws new light from public documents on the condition of Paris under the old system.* We may see in it an astounding picture of misrule. The *Parlement*, the *Hôtel de Ville*, the *Châtelet*, the Governor of Paris, the Governor of the *Bastille*, the

* *L'État de Paris en 1789. Études et Documents sur l'Ancien Régime à Paris.* H. Monin. Paris. Jouast, etc., etc., 1889.

Minister of Paris, the University, the trade-guilds, the church, the religious foundations, all claim privileges, jurisdictions, rights, immunities, which cross and re-cross each other in continual conflict.

There was no real municipality, no true elective representation of the citizens. Certain officials, named by the Crown, professed to speak and to act in the name of the city. Civil and criminal justice was shared by various bodies under quite indefinite authority. The *Châtelet* absorbed in the seventeenth century no less than nineteen baronial jurisdictions; but the Archbishopric and several abbeys retained their own distinct courts. The *Châtelet*, the *Hôtel de Ville*, the church, each divided Paris into distinct sets of local subdivisions. Taxation, public works, justice, police, markets, public health, even hospitals and charities, were under the control of different authorities, with no defined limits. Interminable disputes between the different authorities ensued. Of the streets, one in ten was a *cul-de-sac*. Although the area of Paris is now six or seven times greater than it was before the Revolution, and though the population is nearly four times as great, there are little more than twice as many houses. There were 30,000 beggars in Paris. Down to 1779 the ancient foundation of St. Louis, the *Quinze-Vingts*, held an immense area between the *Louvre* and the *Palais Royal*, blocking up both, as well as the *Rue St. Honoré* and the *Rue Richelieu*. This enclosure, which was a privileged asylum, contained a population of from five to six thousand, not only licensed to beg, but bound to live by begging. It was not until 1786 that the cemetery and charnel-house of the *Saints Innocents* was suppressed. It is hardly credible that little more than a hundred years have passed since, in the densest quarter of Paris, long colonnades of grinning skulls and festering burying-grounds were standing where now we have the lovely fountain of Lescot and Gonjon, transformed indeed, and almost more lovely in its transformation, in the centre of the bright and glowing square that recalls Verona or Genoa.

The censorship of all writings "contrary to law, to the catholic faith, to public morals, or judicial prerogative," opened a wide door for arbitrary power. In the years immediately preceding the Revolution, the *Parlement* of Paris suppressed sixty-five works. One of these is condemned as tending "*à soulever les esprits*." Another is condemned as a libel on Cagliostro! Sunday labor, eating meat in Lent, neglecting to dress the house-

front on a religious procession, playing hazard, "speaking so as to alarm the public," are some of the grounds of a criminal sentence. The most revolting public executions were common in all parts of the city. As if to accustom all to the sight of cruel punishments, some fifty places are recorded as the scenes of these horrible public exposures. The sentence sets out the details of these executions in all their hideous particulars. *Ledit* so-and-so shall be taken to *Notre-Dame*, where his hand shall be chopped off, then taken on a cart to another place, where he shall be broken alive on a wheel, and so left "as long as it shall please God to prolong his life"; then his body shall be burned and the ashes scattered to the winds. A workingman, for stealing some linen, is condemned to be hung on a gibbet and strangled by the public executioner. It was not till 1780 that preliminary torture of an accused person was abolished: torture as part of the sentence was retained till the Revolution. The personal punishments included the pillory, branding, flogging, maiming, strangling, breaking alive, and burning. This is how the ancient Monarchy prepared the people for the guillotine.

The Revolution has swept away all this, and new Paris has sprung to life out of the Revolution, like Athene from the head of the Thunderer. Out of extreme confusion, symmetry; out of ancient privilege, absolute democracy; out of paralysis of rival authorities, intense concentration of authority; out of squalor, splendor; out of barbarism, the latest devices of civilization. Yet, for all these changes, Paris is not Chicago or Washington; it is no fine new city built on an open plain. Her nineteen centuries of history are still there; the gay boulevards stand on the foundationstones of a thousand structures of the past; the placards on each omnibus recall the names of mighty centres of faith, wisdom, devotion, purity, love. The religious passion, the civic ardor, the republican zeal, the wit, the science, the electric will, the social ideals, the devotion to ideas,—are all there as of old. In a deeper sense, "nothing is changed," as Louis XVIII. said on his return, "except that there is another [million or so] of Frenchmen more." And as the traveller passes up and down his Paris of to-day, let us say to him:

"Periculose plenum opus aleæ
Tractas; et incedis per ignes
Suppositos cineri doloso."

—*Horace: Odes. II. 1, lines 6, 7, 8.*

FREDERIC HARRISON.

ARE PUBLIC LIBRARIES PUBLIC BLESSINGS?

BY JAMES M. HUBBARD.

IT IS NOW scarcely forty years since the foundation of the first library owned by the people at large and intended for their use. Up to that time libraries had been either the property of shareholders or supported by subscriptions, or they were connected with societies and educational institutions, or, as in the case of the Astor Library, they were meant solely for students. This, however, was designed primarily to bring within the reach of the clerk, the mechanic, the laborer, all the treasures of literature. The experiment was so immediately successful that it was quickly tried in other places, and now public libraries are to be found in every part of the country.

It would surely be difficult to find, the world over, a more attractive picture, or one which represents in a material form more fully the height to which our civilization has reached, than one of those village greens on which stand side by side the church, the school, the library—that complete triad of the moral and intellectual forces of our age. Especially attractive is it when the library building is, as is not seldom the case, the town's chief architectural ornament, the memorial of some grateful son or honored citizen. Then, with an interior as winning as its exterior is beautiful, with the atmosphere of quiet and repose which the presence and companionship of books almost necessarily bring, even to the rudest, it is difficult to overestimate the refining and elevating influences which it may exert on the natures of many of those to whom its doors are freely opened.

In one respect the library enjoys a peculiar distinction as compared not only with the other two, but with all public institutions, so far as my knowledge goes. The church is more or less closely connected with the body of which it is a member, and consequently has no perfect freedom of action. The school is under the direct supervision of the State. The governing body of

the library alone is practically, in many cases absolutely, independent. In some instances, the town appropriates certain funds for the maintenance of a library and appoints the trustees and, occasionally, the librarian ; and here its power rests. In others, the trustees are a self-appointed, self-continuing body, the citizens having no voice in their selection. They may not even hold the purse, since there may be a permanent fund for the support of a library. In this case the trustees are irresponsible, there being no supreme authority, save public opinion, to whom they must render an account of the manner in which they exercise their powers, or to call them to account for a neglect of their duties.

The question naturally suggests itself in view of this fact, Is there any good and sufficient reason for this independence of control on the part of the directors of public libraries ? And further, Are there any real or possible dangers resulting from it, against which it would be well to guard ? In order to determine whether there is anything in the nature of their duties to justify the irresponsible position of these public officials, it is necessary to state briefly the object for which the public library is established. This is : to promote the education and elevation of the people, or, in other words, to make of it a People's High-School. That was the idea of the original founders. They had visions of young men and women whose circumstances had thrown them upon the world to seek a living in the store, the counting-house, the factory, and at the sewing-machine, with just education enough to awaken a thirst for knowledge ; and they determined that they would give them the means of satisfying this thirst. Who could tell, they thought, how many Arkwrights, Stephensons, Lawrences, or Lincolns there might be among these humble mechanics and clerks, whose powers would be lost to the world if knowledge of books were denied them ?

Not only this, but the library was to be the means of rescuing them from the dangers of the street, the saloon, the low amusements of the poor ; to lift them above the sordid surroundings of their daily life. It is somewhat curious, considered in the light of after developments, that the Boston Public Library, and with it the whole public-library movement, owed its origin largely to the dread of the dangers of excessive novel-reading by the young. Joshua Bates, the London banker, whose munificent gifts made that institution a possibility, wrote that he did this in order to

“save those who, left to themselves, [would] waste their time in railroad literature, chiefly American novels. These publications are doing immense mischief.”

The instruction, then, of the people was to be originally, and still ought to be, the chief object of the public library. And, it should be said in passing, in many places trustees, librarians, and school-teachers, especially, are earnestly striving to realize all that its various founders and benefactors have hoped from it. But to the education of the people it has from the first added the task of furnishing them with entertainment, and, at the same time, it threw open its doors to children. Naturally, they alone have availed themselves to the utmost of the privileges offered them, and naturally, too, they read almost exclusively the novels and story-books provided for them. Soon all other uses of the library were insignificant compared with this. From 70 to 80 per cent., and in some instances practically the whole, of the books circulated were fiction, read chiefly by the children. Notwithstanding the strenuous efforts for some years past of many having the charge of libraries in different places to counteract this tendency, it still remains the fact that about three-quarters of their circulation is of this character. That is, the libraries are in no true sense of the words educators of the people. They are the haunt, in every place, of a few scholars and persons of leisure, but their chief work is to furnish amusement for the young.

This fact alone, to my mind, very greatly diminishes the attractiveness of the picture, to which I have referred, of the beautiful building filled with the treasures of literature and thronged with eager readers. So far as the children are concerned, I am confident that, even if the novels at their command were the very best in the language, they would be far better off without them, and if dependent alone upon what their homes could afford for such recreation. But there are other facts which, when fairly and honestly considered, must make many seriously doubt whether the public libraries, as at present generally administered, are not a grave evil to the communities in which they are placed.

Forty years ago, many persons in New England and in the States settled by New-Englanders had a strong prejudice against all novel-reading, many holding it to be a downright sin. Others, more enlightened, did not go so far as this, but objected decidedly to the reading of novels by children. Still

others, again, permitted their children to read novels, but were very careful in their selection and strict in their prohibitions. "Jane Eyre," I distinctly remember, was a prohibited book in my youth, and Bulwer was a forbidden author, as were all French writers. But the standard of selection of books for the public libraries, if originally high, soon fell so low in many as to admit all novels above the very lowest grade. Where the funds were plentiful, as in the larger cities, practically everything above a dime-novel was purchased. The natural result of this indiscriminate buying was that tens, nay hundreds, of books which the best critics had pronounced profoundly immoral in their tendency and teaching found their way into the hands of children. If protests were made,—and in some places they were continually made,—the ready answer on the part of trustees or librarians was that it was a people's library, and that what the public asked for should be supplied. Others urged that it was necessary to have books even of a poor character in order to attract readers who would read nothing else, and who, once brought from the dance-hall or the street-corner to frequent the library, would be educated up from the reading of the most sensational novel to the enjoyment of Scott and Shakespeare. It seems almost silly to refute this argument, and yet, urged as it was by some well-known writers, it probably still retains its specious force. For there is an element of truth in it which renders it fascinating to certain philanthropic, but illogical, persons.

To make this theory effective, the strictest control over the reading is absolutely necessary. The dime-novel, the sensational story, must be succeeded by one of a slightly higher grade, and if this process be rigidly carried out, possibly now and then a street-boy, if he possess exceptional abilities, may be brought to an intelligent appreciation of the classics of romance. But to imagine that this same result could be produced by giving such a lad the free range of a great collection of novels, good, bad, and indifferent, is simply the mark of ignorance of human nature. Not one in a hundred, under these circumstances, unaided and unrestrained, would go from the bad to the better and gradually thence to the highest walks of literature. And these persons wholly lost sight of the fact that, in attempting to rescue one street-boy by this means, they exposed a hundred other children to the danger of forming a taste for the lowest class of novels.

These, then, are the facts. Not only have the public libraries, as a whole, failed to reach their proper aim of giving the means of education to the people,—not necessarily, it should be said, through any fault of their guardians,—but they have gone aside from their true path to furnish amusement merely, and that in part of a pernicious character, chiefly to the young.

A few years ago this evil was far greater than it apparently is at present. Then so numerous were the works of notoriously immoral authors in our larger public libraries that many parents would no more permit their children to frequent them than they would allow them to go to a low theatre or a variety show. Public opinion at length became aroused, and there was a general reform. Many of these objectionable works were removed from the shelves of libraries in every part of the country. But doubtless the force of this outburst of public opinion has now spent itself, and this purifying work needs to be done over again. For one cannot take up a library catalogue without finding in it a score or more of books which no child should read.

The whole of the danger which a public library may be to the community to which it belongs has not yet been fully revealed. In some of the city libraries, and possibly in some of the town libraries,—but of this I have no certain knowledge,—there is a department, technically known by some as “The Inferno,” in which books of unquestioned and undisguised immorality are kept. They are, I hasten to say, not all, probably only a very small proportion of them, of the “Decameron” type—immoral books, but still classics in spite of their character and for other reasons. They are to-day, more frequently, books noteworthy simply because of their wickedness, not because of any literary or historical merit—books just exactly as worthy of being preserved as pictures which are remarkable merely on account of their gross obscenity. The numbers of these books which are being produced mainly in Europe, both original works and the republications of works produced in a more depraved age, would probably astonish many of my readers. They are published chiefly, no doubt, to satisfy the prurient tastes of individuals; but the fact that libraries are also constant and certain purchasers must be an important factor in leading to their publication. Many a trustee, it can hardly be questioned, who would not dream of buying such books for his private library, and would shudder with horror if he saw them in

the hands of his daughters, purchases them for the public library under his charge without a qualm of conscience. And there they lie, a mass of corruption, having, probably in all cases, a very limited circulation; but still, one can be assured, they are not bought to be locked up from every eye—needing, like low-fever germs, but light and air to break into a moral pestilence.

From the existence of these two evils, the circulation of books among young people of a character especially injurious to them, and the gathering of collections of openly-immoral works,—evils for which there is, so far as I am aware, no direct remedy in the hands of the public,—I assert that the trustees of our public libraries should be held responsible to some more definite tribunal than that of public opinion. I might have mentioned other possible dangers, such as the power of the directors of any library to make it a propaganda of any delusive *ism* or doctrine subversive of morality, society, or government; but I prefer to rest my case here.

The next inquiry is whether there is any way of controlling the enormous power exercised by a few irresponsible persons in moulding the characters and forming the habits of thought of a large and the most promising part of the youth of our land.

The true remedy for the first of these evils is, of course, to give up entirely the circulation of all novels among children. I am conscious, however, that the public is not yet ready for this heroic remedy, though I have not the slightest hesitation in affirming that it will come to it in time; not because of the dangers connected with this practice, but because of its expense. When the public sees clearly that it would actually be cheaper for a public library to *give away* fifty copies of a story like Stevenson's "Treasure Island," for instance, published in newspaper form, than to buy *one* copy in book form and circulate it twenty-five times, then it will peremptorily demand the cessation of this costly process of furnishing free entertainment of a doubtful character to the young. Failing this desirable reform, I would suggest the passing of a general act by our State legislatures making it a penal offence, punishable by fine or imprisonment, for any persons connected with a public library to loan to a minor any book of an immoral character after they shall have received official notice from the proper authority that it is immoral. And I should add to the act this further provision, that no book of an openly-immoral character should be permitted to leave the library building.

The intent of this provision, of course, would be to limit the reading of such books to proper persons.

But the most important question is, Who shall constitute this "proper authority"? It is evident that it must be a body whose decisions, being final and without appeal, shall commend themselves to the people as intelligent and impartial. It cannot be a mere local board, for except in the larger towns and cities it would be difficult to find persons qualified to exercise this authority wisely. In some places there are "examining committees" of leading citizens appointed by the trustees to investigate into the workings of the library, to point out evils, and to suggest reforms, but many years' experience has proved that these committees, however well-meaning and intelligent, cannot be relied upon to do a reforming work. In some instances their reports have simply served to hide the evils which it was their duty to expose.

It is not necessary to create any new board of State censors of public libraries, for there is already existing in all our States, if I am not mistaken, a body of officials impliedly well qualified for the task. I mean the Board of Education. Here are a number of citizens of high standing whose official work is entirely in connection with the education of the young, who ought to be the best judges of what books would be injurious to the immature mind, and whose judgments would command the entire respect and confidence of the community. To them should be referred any book which a parent or teacher regarded as harmful, and if on their examination it proved, in their judgment, to be unfit for the reading of young people, their notification of this fact to the different public libraries of the State should cause its immediate withdrawal from circulation. In addition, it should be required of every public library to send to the Board of Education a list of all works of notorious and undisguised immorality which it contained, and thereafter annually to send a list of all such works purchased within the year, together with their cost and the number of times which they were consulted. It will be evident, I think, that this provision would tend greatly to check these purchases, which, from the very nature of the case, are now made secretly, the fact that such books are in the library not being made evident in the public catalogues. The Board, having before it an exact statement, would know the extent of the evil and its dangerous possibilities to any special community, and would doubtless

find means, if necessary, to put an end to it altogether in individual cases. Trustees naturally would hesitate any longer to spend comparatively large sums—for these books are invariably very costly—for the productions of these literary *cloacæ*, if they had to make an official report of the fact to the State authorities.

I am sanguine enough to believe that these measures, or measures similar to them, if adopted, would have an influence which would reach farther than the public libraries themselves. In them, I am confident, it would be powerful for good. Purchasing committees and agents would be far more careful in their selection of books for these institutions, if they knew that their choice in doubtful cases would possibly be subjected to official scrutiny and censure, and with every year there would, in all probability, be less and less occasion for the Board to exercise its functions as censor. But beyond and above this, I believe that literature itself would be influenced by the action of this Board. Now there is no authority to pronounce a book immoral in its tendency and teaching, unless it is of so gross a character as to come within the reach of the law against obscene publications; and of these I have not been treating. Accordingly an author may offend glaringly against the public morals and not suffer for it, except in the adverse criticisms of the press, which simply help the sale of the book. But let a novel be officially pronounced unfit for circulation in the public libraries of a dozen States by the Boards of Education of those States, and the thing would wear an entirely different aspect both to author and publisher. Simply from the point of view of the latter, the cutting-off of this important purchaser, the public library, would be a very serious consideration. But the reproach of an official branding, as it were, of one's work would, I am convinced, deter many a young and foolish author from seeking popularity by such dangerous and degrading means. To take but a single instance: had such a power as I propose rested in our various Boards of Education, I do not believe that "The Quick or the Dead?" would ever have been written. But it is to the public library that the greatest gain would come. The official recognition of it as an integral and important part of the general system of education would tend to raise it to the very highest plane of usefulness.

JAMES MASCARENE HUBBARD.

THE REAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN.

BY MRS. ROSE TERRY COOKE.

THERE IS so much said of late years about the “Rights of Women” that the phrase has become to some women a terror and a disgust; though a certain class have made it a war-cry, and attached to it a meaning and an importance alike unwarranted and unpleasant.

Those who thus clamor for their “rights” mean by that phrase, to express the matter succinctly, the rights of women to be men. It is useless here either to ignore or contend with their dogmas, for in the end they will inevitably expose their own futility and presumption. It would be simple folly to notice the effort of a botanist to transform all the currant-bushes in the country into oak-trees; and no man or set of men would attempt to train cats to the duties and offices of dogs: ridicule would extinguish their essays and contempt be their portion. The Creator who peopled the earth with various sorts of animals, and made it beautiful with forests and flowers, each bearing seed according to its kind, when he also created man to rule over them, made also a distinction in humanity. “Male and female created he them,” and no puny struggles of the race can nullify his original purpose. But in all this clamor, and the just scorn with which the more rational portion of the race treat it, there has been little or no attention paid to the fact that women—as women—have certain rights of their own coexistent with their position in life, which are too apt to be ignored by the men with whom they are associated in any relation. Let us examine a few of these rights, which ought to be self-evident both to men and women.

First—A woman has a right to respect, as a woman, as long as she respects herself. It is true that it is difficult for men to do this when the spirit of the age is against such an opinion. We

find the newspapers full of skits at women : their folly, their extravagance, their ignorance, their shortcomings as mothers, wives, girls in society, especially mothers-in-law and "old maids," are the theme of story and illustration everywhere. And it is not women who write these stories or sketch these illustrations, but men who have mothers, sisters, and wives of their own. Any true and manly man should show respect to women for the sake of his own mother—the mother who bore him at the risk of her very life in cruel anguish and intolerable terror; who reared him with a mother's patience through his helpless infancy and ungrateful childhood : for this office alone should he respect the sex to which he owes so much. And the man whose wife has borne him a family of children should be branded by society as he is by God if he treats that wife with less respect and honor than he would the noblest and greatest among men. Yet the world swarms with men who rob women of this inalienable right all their wretched lives ; who treat their mothers and their wives with contumely and cruelty. All women know this to be true, and resent in their hearts the contempt of their husbands and brothers and sons. This it is that drives them thoughtlessly into a struggle to remodel the laws of the land through the doubtful expedient of woman suffrage, through which they hope to reform the laws in their favor. A little calm reflection would show them that any law is worthless that is not enforced by public opinion or public and pressing need. Yearly our legislatures enact laws that are daily broken. Who keeps the dog laws, the liquor laws, the laws of trespass, and numerous other statutes ? Laws deliberately broken are worse than useless ; they are the seeds of rebellion and anarchy ; and no human law will help women to abrogate divine edicts. The only hope of women lies in the training of their sons : the boy who is taught from infancy to obey and respect his parents will be worth more to the cause of true "women's rights" than a whole code of legal enactments.

Second—Women have a right to care and consideration on the score of their physical organization. However eager and voluble is the clamor of the "Women's Rights" party to be placed on an equality with men, the very laws of Nature laugh at such a reasonless demand. Can a woman, even an abnormally-strong woman, do the hard, rough work of the world ? Can women construct railways, canals, houses, sail ships, clear away

forests, become pioneers of civilization, or explore remote places of the earth? Could a woman do what Stanley has done? Could she even perform the labor of a common "navvy," who digs all day, week after week, year after year? Every woman knows, if she would only allow it, that this is impossible. Men have an incontrovertible argument against this equality in "their dynamic reasons of stronger bones," and every man knows that women are "the weaker sex" by reason of their physical constitution: therefore I say that women have a right to care and consideration on this account. But do they get it? Where is the man, among the working class especially, who will not let his wife, his mother, his daughter, or his sister overwork herself for his support or his aggrandizement? The records of our lunatic asylums fully bear out this statement: one-third of their female patients come from farms, where they rise early and go to rest late, working incessantly through winter and summer, no matter what is their physical condition; bearing and rearing children through it all; uncheered by recreation, unsolaced by rest; not so much considered as the herded cows or the stabled horses, for these animals cost hard-earned money, but a woman can be had for the asking, and worked like a slave without wages. It is a mistaken economy that deprives women of the kindness and care that should lighten their burdens and assuage their anxiety. Men assume toward them the attitude of the immortal Bagnet toward his capable wife,—

"I never saw the old girl's equal! But I never own to it before her. Discipline must be maintained!"

A few kind words, a little appreciation, even a frank acknowledgment of the work she has done, are like reviving balm to weak and weary women; it pays to praise us—we are so foolishly fond of kind words.

*"A merry heart goes all the day;
Your sad one tires in a mile-a!"*

And is not this small and easily-rendered wage, which benefits the giver as well as the receiver, a true right of every woman?

Third—A woman has a right to her own religious opinions and preferences; but how rarely is it accorded to her. The married woman almost inevitably leaves her own church and goes with her husband, whether he is a member of the church he attends or

not. Daughters, too, come to years of discretion, whatever may be their opinions or their wishes, are almost always expected to go to church with their parents. Indeed, not long since I read a pamphlet in defence of a certain sect, of which the opening argument was that people should always go to church where their parents did ! This extraordinary reasoning, which in its full extent would render futile all endeavors to convert Romanists, Jews, infidels, or even hereditary heathen, to a better way than that in which their ancestors walked, is carried out in too many families to-day. It is as much a woman's right as a man's to select the denomination to which she will belong.

Fourth—Every mother-woman has a right to share in the decisions of the father concerning their children's education. It is impossible for a man engaged in the active business of life, separated from his children during the weekdays and not extremely intimate with them on Sundays, to understand their characters as well as the mother, who is their daily friend and guide. She knows how the timid and sensitive nature of one of her girls unfits her for fighting her way through a public school ; while the courage, alacrity, and self-confidence of another will thrive in such a conflict with others, and find its true level there. She knows that the dreamy, studious boy, who does not care for athletic sports or mathematical problems, but spends his leisure in the fields inspecting stones with his geological hammer, hunting for floral specimens, impaling rare and curious insects round the crown of his hat, is meant to be a professor of natural sciences ; while his sturdy, hearty young brother, always "trading" and "dickering" with his fellows, standing high in his arithmetic class, and with a keen eye for his just share in "treats," will be a successful merchant. To the unacquainted father these are generalized as boys and girls, he is just as likely as not to insist on putting the naturalist into a dry-goods shop and trying to make a clergyman of the sharp boy ; and it is here that the mother's right to advise, and even insist, comes in ; it is the right of superior knowledge, and should be willingly conceded to her.

Fifth—A woman has a right to choose her own husband. To her belong all the consequences of such a choice. It is well to offer advice, to set before her the true character of the man she elects to marry, and thereby to clear your own conscience,—the only good result, as a general thing, of such advice !—but to at-

tempt coercion of any sort is a fatal error. Marriage is the great disciplinary institution of the sexes, and its general trend and special detail cannot be averted or avoided by the average man and woman. To women a mistake in this matter is a mistake that involves portentous consequences, and no reasonable man or woman should be willing to take the great responsibility of directing or forcing that choice which will make or mar a whole life. The angelic young women in modern novels, who marry men they loathe to save a father or a brother from deserved shame or pecuniary ruin, are not and should not be the women of real life. "Thou shalt not do evil that good may come" is a divine truth, and ought to be impressed on the minds of our girls. But there is little danger that they will to-day indulge in such self-sacrifice; their end and aim are chiefly to "have a good time," and if they mistake the way to that end they learn a great and stern lesson, which may educate them for the eternal future. Therefore, as it is a purely individual matter, concerning the parties thereto far more than any one else, I contend that it is the inalienable right of every woman to select her own husband and take the consequences on her own shoulders.

Sixth—A woman should be allowed to choose her own physician. This seems on its face to be a trivial matter, but it is one that involves much suffering or much comfort, and is intimately connected with her health—that greatest of earthly blessings. For women, particularly in illness, are nervous, fastidious, and susceptible to odd impressions and strange fancies to an extent no man can comprehend. A sick man is cross or stupid; if he is that *rara avis*, a patient sufferer, he is also silent and grateful; but a woman fidgets, cries, exhausts herself with imaginary terrors and apprehensions, and looks forward to her physician's visits with disgust or delight, as the case may be. If she is so unfortunate as to dislike the aspect, the manner, the voice of the most skilful doctor to be had, he will do her little good: she will not tell him her symptoms; she will resent his lightest touch; she will probably refuse to take his prescriptions, or find some means of disposing of his pills and potions wide of their due destination; while if she likes the face and speech of another, much less skilful it may be, his presence will give her comfort, allay her nervous exasperation, and soothe her terrors; her pulse will grow quiet, her restlessness subside, and she will accept his

doses with that faith in their efficacy which adds so much to the power of all drugs, and invests the tiniest sugary pellets with all-powerful virtues. It is the petty tyranny of many men to force upon their households physicians of their own choosing, who are objectionable to their wives or daughters: it would be for the good of such autocrats if they reflected that this procedure injures themselves in its reflex action, for it only prolongs the invalidism of the shrinking and suffering patient, and makes the bills, which even autocrats detest, far heavier than they like to pay. Therefore, for the sake of both parties it is best—would it be idle to add kindest?—for women to be allowed this useful right, and to choose the presence that cheers them and the face they trust to medicine both mind and body.

Seventh—Every woman has a right to a home, unless stringent circumstances prevent. I mean to a home in the house of her husband or her father. This seems an unnecessary statement to many people; yet there are instances, numerous enough, where it applies. There may be a nominal home, where a wife leads such an unconsidered, down-trodden existence, so lorn and loveless a life, that it is no real home to her, but the dwelling of a captive in the grip of a tyrant; a position where even her children treat her with cold contempt, and the very servants of the house ignore and despise her. Is this to be called a home? Yet such there are; some that I have personally known; more of which I have heard. And there are parents who, for reasons they do not make known, exile their children from their houses; often to please the caprices of other members of the family who do not desire to be bored or affronted by the offending member; often for some freak of their own temper or perverted idea of their own unfilled demands. No idea of duty inspires or daunts them; they do not reflect that they gave existence to these children and owe them unfailing patience and kindness to alleviate that infliction. To deprive a boy or a girl of the shelter and refuge and amenities of a household to which he or she has a birthright is an intolerable injustice, and one that seems impossible; yet is not.

I once heard a man say to his wife, referring to the trouble his wayward daughter gave her (the daughter of his earlier marriage):

“I wish I could afford to send her away to school, and spare you this anxiety and trouble.”

“Never!” was the energetic reply. “Not if you were worth millions. She is your child, and she has a right to a home in her father’s house; it is my duty to make her home a shelter and benefit to her; and I will, at whatever cost to myself!”

Is not this the right thing to do? Is a man or woman ever cast into such piteous and unchristian exile as when he or she has “no place on the earth to call home,” as I heard a woman say once, with a voice of mortal sadness?

Eighth—A woman has a right to the use and control of her own money, whether she inherits or earns it. There is a general feeling among married men that women ought not to have money of their own; that they should ask their masters for every cent they need. I have known a man to invest his wife’s small portion, and make her come to him for every needed dollar, until, being a woman of spirit, she insisted on an allowance. I have known another to take the money left to his children, absolutely to be in their own control, and, without ever rendering them account, invest it in ways they knew nothing of and which proved greatly to their loss, long after they were of full age. They could not go to law with their father, as another set of heirs might have done, but had to bear this injustice and dishonesty as best they might. I have known still another, unfortunately executor of his father-in-law’s will, to take money left his wife under that will and spend it as he pleased, so that when she needed and demanded it it was gone. And yet another who, being trustee of an estate from which his wife received a considerable annuity, never allowed her to have one cent of that income, though he was a rich man himself. Nor did he ever give her any money for her own use; she had a bill at the grocer’s and the shoe-shop, but he bought her clothes without any reference to her wishes, and paid her dress-maker. I could multiply such instances till time failed me; they are the rule rather than the exception; and these are the humiliating and painful experiences that have driven women to arise and fight for the chimerical rights they demand, considering those the real way to amend the sufferings they do not exploit.

When men are ready to allow women their true and just rights, to remember the admonitions of Holy Writ,—“Husbands, love your wives and be not bitter against them”; “Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honor unto the wife as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace

of life, that your prayers be not hindered" (significant latter clause !); "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it"; "Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath"; "Fathers, provoke not your children to anger, lest they be discouraged,"—then the true rights of women will be achieved. We have much from pulpit and press to impress on us the duties of wives and children; for it is men who preach and edit; but all duty is of its own nature reciprocal, and the other side of these family obligations is just as stringent as that commonly preached and written about.

Looking over the social, the conjugal, the parental status of the sexes in this age of progress, it is sad to see that the true rights of women are so frequently ignored and set aside. It is true we owe the delay of our restoration to these God-given privileges greatly to those "freedom-shriekers" who forget their position and their womanhood, who leave their families neglected and their homes forsaken to rant on platforms and usurp pulpits; the women who demand suffrage for themselves when as yet they are too weak and ignorant to use so mighty a weapon, and try to reverse the creative ordinance that did not make the race all men. These idle and reasonless demands react on the more sensible and faithful part of their own sex, and give men, who are so apt to be deluded by "glittering generalities," the idea that all women are fools.

I can but close this attempt to show that we women have some rights that ought in the name of religion and humanity to be respected, but, alas! rarely are, with repeating what Mrs. Siddons said to Samuel Rogers when once her proud soul was sore at seeing honors heaped upon a brother-actor which she knew she better deserved herself, yet never would attain,—

"I hope, Mr. Rogers, that one day justice will be done to women!"

ROSE TERRY COOKE.

NURSERIES OF CRIME.

BY THOMAS BYRNES, CHIEF INSPECTOR OF POLICE, NEW YORK CITY.

THE LODGING-HOUSES of New York constitute an evil of large and growing proportions. This fact is palpable to any one who has to deal with the criminal classes here, or who is familiar with the methods of life in the least respectable parts of the city through missionary work or in any other way. Of lodging-houses in other cities I have no personal knowledge ; but it is fair to presume that the same evil exists in all large cities to a greater or less extent. In the following pages I speak only of New York, and the facts mentioned have all come within the range of my personal experience.

It is undeniable that the lodging-houses of the city have a powerful tendency to produce, foster, and increase crime. Instead of being places where respectable people reduced in circumstances or temporarily short of money can secure a clean bed for a small amount of money, they have come to be very largely frequented by thieves and other criminals of the lowest class, who lodge in these resorts regularly and here consort together and lay their plans for crimes of one sort or another. But this is not the worst feature of the matter. Take the case of a young man who runs away from his home in the country, or for any reason finds himself stranded in the great city. In searching for a cheap place to lodge in, he naturally drifts into one of these lodging-houses, and it is almost inevitable that association with the people who make these places their headquarters will corrupt him. In nine cases out of ten—I am quite confident that this proportion is not too large—he turns out a thief or a burglar, if, indeed, he does not sooner or later become a murderer. Hundreds of instances of this kind occur every year.

The lodging-house in New York is a modern institution. It was started by a man named Howe, who came here from Boston, about twelve years ago. He opened his first lodging-house in

Chatham Street (now Park Row), near Tryon Row. It was a success, and he soon extended the business. When he died, seven years ago, he left a large fortune as the result of his shrewd management of this new enterprise. The number of lodging-houses has increased rapidly since Howe made his first venture, and there are now three hundred and forty-five such places in the city. There is one class in which fifteen, twenty, or twenty-five cents are charged for a night's lodging, while in another and lower class the prices are only five and ten cents. According to the "Report of the Police Department of the City of New York for the Year Ending December 31, 1888," the "enormous number of 4,649,660 cheap lodgings were furnished during the year" in these resorts. The following table, taken from the report, shows the distribution of lodging-houses among the various precincts :

PRECINCTS.	Lodging-houses and dormitories.			PRECINCTS.	Lodging-houses and dormitories.		
	Num-ber.	Number of rooms.	Lodgers, 1888.		Num-ber.	Number of rooms.	Lodgers, 1888.
First.....	9	325	77,925	Thirteenth....	6	22	66,560
Second.....	21	346	73,045	Fourteenth...	5	138	142,350
Fourth.....	39	2,307	597,870	Fifteenth...	14	636	256,585
Fifth.....	3	24	45,150	Eighteenth....	3	43	173,375
Sixth.....	44	2,086	913,050	Twentieth....	1	90	...
Seventh.....	13	294	127,155	Twenty-first..	9	159	63,837
Eighth.....	11	112	182,500	Twenty-fifth..	1	241	36,794
Ninth.....	3	279	77,600	Twenty-ninth.	13	549	104,287
Tenth.....	12	1,374	438,365	Total.....	267	10,439	4,649,660
Eleventh.....	58	1,293	1,243,200				
Twelfth.....	2	121	30,012				

These figures are obtained by inquiry among the keepers of the known lodging-houses, and, while they do not wholly agree with what I learn from other sources, they are, no doubt, fairly accurate.

There is no law that governs or applies to these places of which I am speaking, except certain sections of the Sanitary Code of the Board of Health, which give the Health Department the right to exercise supervision over them in the matter of cleanliness. In connection with this phase of the subject it will be of interest to quote further from the report of the Police Department for last year.

"Attention has repeatedly been called to that portion of the city covered by the Fourth, Sixth, Tenth and Eleventh Precincts. From the table of arrests it will be

seen that in 1888 there were 23,146 persons arrested in this comparatively small district, or 27.24 per cent. of the entire number of arrests—an increase over the year 1887. Eighteen per cent. of the pawn-shops are located there; more than 16 per cent. of the liquor and beer saloons of the city are flourishing there; more than 57 per cent. of the cheap lodging-houses ply a busy trade, and they furnish nearly 70 per cent. of the lodgings indicated above.

“Again it is urged that there should be some legal regulation by which the cheap lodging-houses could be placed under police supervision. Though it is admitted that many of the patrons of these places are persons in distressed circumstances, yet, where so many are herded together daily and nightly, it is reasonable to suppose there are many disposed to crime. If tenement life tends to immorality and vice certainly the fifty-eight lodging-houses in the Eleventh Precinct, furnishing 1,243,200 lodgings in one year, must have the same or a worse tendency. Reflection upon the figures contained in the above table will lead to the conclusion that we have a large population of impecunious people (all males) which ought to be regarded with some concern.

“It is shown above that an average of 13,152 persons without homes and the influence of family lodged nightly in the station-houses* and in these poorly-provided dormitories—an army of idlers, willing or forced. It is respectfully submitted that social reformers would here find a field for speculation, if not for considerable activity.”

The cheapest class of lodging-houses are generally the resort of drunkards and people of the lowest type, though all of them are infested with thieves, idlers, and loafers of every description. Hence it is no exaggeration to assert that they are very hot-beds of crime. More than one murder has been committed in these houses. One well-remembered crime of this sort was that of Quimbo Appo, who stabbed and killed a young man named John Kelly in a lodging-house in Chatham Street. Kelly was the son of respectable parents, but had fallen into dissolute habits, and was accustomed to spend his nights in these resorts. One night Quimbo got into an altercation with him; blows followed, and the result was that Kelly received fatal wounds. Another man was killed in the Phoenix lodging-house in the Bowery. He applied for a lodging, which for some reason was refused; he quarrelled with the clerk, and the clerk killed him, being subsequently acquitted on the ground of justifiable homicide. It was at this same Phoenix house that I and my men not long ago arrested the notorious Greenwall and Miller on the charge of murdering Mr. Lyman S. Weeks in Brooklyn. There is little doubt in my mind that this murder, a most dastardly crime (Mr. Weeks being shot down in his own house by a burglar who had invaded it), was hatched in this or some other house of like character. In the very same place three men were arrested recently for a burglary

* During 1888 there were 150,812 lodgings furnished at the station-houses of the city, making the total number of lodgings 4,800,472.

committed in a residence in Mount Vernon. At the lodging-house No. 262 Bowery we secured a gang of thieves who had been engaged in a series of robberies at Kingston, N. Y., and they were sent up there for punishment. Among other cases of criminals who made their abode in houses of this sort may be mentioned the following, all the acts being of recent occurrence : Charles Hoffman, convicted of highway robbery and sent to the State-prison ; James McGann, burglary, sent to the State-prison ; Hugh O'Neill, burglary, sent to the State-prison ; Jacob Meyer, burglary, sent to the State-prison. There are hundreds of other instances of the same kind.

A case somewhat out of the ordinary run was that of Henry Bishoff, who was convicted of forgery on the complaint of a well-known business man. Bishoff had only been in this country for a year, and for some months he had been out of employment. During this time he lived at the Victoria Hotel lodging-house, at No. 9 Bowery. There he was inoculated with criminal ideas, and he made it a practice to follow letter-carriers while making deliveries. When letters were deposited in small boxes in front of stores and lofts, and a good opportunity presented itself, Bishoff would abstract them by means of long keys and a piece of steel wire. In this way he got a letter out of the box of a leading clothing firm. It was from a Philadelphia house, and contained a check or draft for a large sum. He forged the indorsement of the New York firm, and obtained the money. Subsequently he was arrested by this bureau,* and sentenced to a long term in prison.

Within the last three years crime has increased very rapidly, so far as the lodging-houses of the city are concerned. A large number of young fellows hailing from these places have been arrested for stealing blankets from horses whose drivers have been compelled to leave them for a minute or two, or for picking up anything else of trifling value that they could lay hands on. These are beginners in crime, as a rule, and they undoubtedly associate with older and more experienced men, who tell them how and where to dispose of their booty for a small sum of money. It is in this way that young men get their initiation in crime. I personally have arrested a considerable number of men in lodging-houses for carrying burglars' tools. Hundreds of criminals must

* The Detective Bureau of the New York Police Department.

be made every year through the associations they form in these breeding-places of lawlessness.

Lying on my desk as I write are two tin-types of the cheapest sort, evidently taken in the Bowery. They represent two young "toughs," each holding a pistol at the head of the other. They were taken from the pockets of the young fellows, who were brought into my office the other day on charges of robbery. These photographs interested me, and I asked the boys how they came to be taken in that style. "Oh," they answered, "we held a pistol up to the head of a man one night and got his money, and we just thought we would like to see how we looked." They seemed rather proud of their achievement. I mention this as an illustration of the sort of young criminals the lodging-houses of New York turn out.

During the last two or three years at least four hundred young men have been arrested for petty crimes that originated here. In many of these cases it was the first step in crime that was being taken. Observation in the courts convinces me that three-fourths of the young men called on to plead to various offences are under twenty years of age; they are poorly clad and without means. Their crimes are petty ones as a rule, and they seem to have no realizing sense of the enormity of their deeds. It is the customary thing, when such people are arraigned in the Court of General Sessions, for the judges to assign counsel to defend them, since these criminals have no money to hire professional advice.

Some twelve or thirteen thousand persons sleep almost nightly in the lodging-houses of the city, some of which have as many as three hundred beds. Among the houses of the lowest order are the Kingston in East Broadway, some of those already mentioned, and those at the following numbers: 15, 23, 34, and 68 Bowery, 18 Pell Street, 9 Doyers Street, 197 Worth Street, 33, 35, and 62 Mulberry Street, 44 East Houston Street, 176, 184, and 194 Park Row, and 9 Mulberry Street. One of the very lowest of all is that at No. 18 Pell Street. The charge there is five cents a night, and the lodgers sleep on strips of canvas suspended by ropes, something after the fashion of hammocks. Suppose that a young man, who finds himself in the city without a home or friends or money, gets into a place of this kind; it will take not more than ten days at the furthest to familiarize him with crime

and criminals, and the chances of his leading an honest life afterwards are not one in a hundred—hardly one in a thousand. There are a few Italian lodging-houses in the city; they are very low and dirty, and give the police the greatest trouble of all.

It has frequently been stated to me by thieves that large numbers of foreigners who are criminals have their passage paid to this country by the authorities or by somebody else. When they land here they have no money, or very little, and they immediately flock to the lodging-houses, where they can live for almost nothing, where they meet people congenial to them, and are soon put in the way of engaging again in their criminal pursuits. I remember the case of a boy named Fritz who came here from Antwerp not long ago, and secured employment with one Jacob Thoman. Thoman noticed that the boy acted in a queer, nervous way, and questioned him, whereupon the boy confessed that in Prussia, his native country, he had had a quarrel with another boy, and in a moment of passion had dashed his brains out. The boy was arrested by detectives from this office, and the matter was brought to the attention of the German consul. But the consul had no official advices regarding the matter, no charge was pressed against the boy, and he was discharged. He then went to live in one of the low lodging-houses, where, I suppose, he was instructed in crime. At all events, in a short time he was detected in the act of committing a burglary in the place of business of his former employer. Only recently I arrested a man who was engaged in robbing private houses in the upper part of the city. He told me that he had been sent here on account of being caught in thieving operations "on the other side." He had no money when he arrived except a few shillings, and almost the first place he got into was one of the cheap lodging-houses. He soon became acquainted with the inmates, who were mostly thieves, and in a little while they took him out over the city and set him to stealing. I have not the least doubt that there are numerous cases like this.

But the evils that have been already mentioned are not the only ones that are produced by the lodging-house system. It is notorious that these houses are used every year for the "colonization" of voters. A large number of men register regularly from these places, and they have not the slightest hesitation about swearing in their votes in case they are challenged. Now and then somebody comes to grief through this practice, but it still

flourishes. Not long ago the proprietor of the Windsor, at No. 41 Bowery, was sent to prison for "colonizing" voters. But usually this work is done in the interest of some local political "boss," who stands by the owner of the house in case the latter gets into trouble. This alone is certainly an evil of large dimensions.

I might cite many other cases that have come under my personal observation, where crimes have been the direct offspring of life in lodging-houses. Take the case of "Mike" Drohan, a notorious thief, who lived at the Windsor, to which reference has just been made. Drohan went to Johnstown after the recent horrible disaster, and was shot and killed while engaged in the fiendish work of robbing the dead bodies of victims of the flood. Assuredly there was a case where a criminal got something like his just deserts. Again, these lodging-houses become the dwelling-places of many of the convicts who are released from prison. These men have little money, and very naturally they gravitate to these places, where they are likely to find people they know. These houses they use as their rendezvous, and there they soon arrange to meet their companions and to plot various crimes. Lodging-houses thus play an important part in causing ex-convicts to resume their former vocation.

It may be asked whether these resorts do not serve any useful purpose. Undoubtedly there are frequently worthy people who are glad of an opportunity to get a night's lodging for a trifle; but these are a small minority of the *habitués* of such houses. In the course of my professional duty here I have found among the patrons of these places a sprinkling of professional men who have held good positions in society—lawyers, doctors, civil-engineers, and even authors. In the usual course they have become drunkards, and have gone down the ladder step by step until they have been abandoned by their friends, and have become drunken sots in the lowest lodging-houses, presenting no difference in their personal appearance from the commonest patrons of such places. It would require a conversation with these people to show that they were educated, and had sunk from a lofty position through a lack of will-power. I remember one who was brought here on suspicion, who belonged to a family that had held an exalted position in society. He was the black sheep of the family, and had at length got so low as to consort with the class

of people that are to be found in the cheapest lodging-houses. There seemed to be no possibility of reclaiming him, and I suppose he will spend his days there.

Such is the evil—a menace to good order and the well-being of society of rapidly enlarging proportions. And the remedy? That I conceive to lie outside of my province as a police official. But I am convinced that a remedy ought to be applied—a drastic, searching remedy—and applied without delay. This is not a case for a palliative; as Emerson would say, it is a “case for a gun”—for the knife, the blister, the amputating instruments. I will venture to offer one or two suggestions only, which philanthropists who endeavor to solve the problem may care to take into account. There should be stringent laws enacted by the Legislature for the regulation of lodging-houses in this city. The records and books of these houses should be open at all times to the inspection of the proper authorities. It should be made a misdemeanor for the proprietor of such a house to mutilate or destroy his books, and he should be compelled to keep an accurate record of all his lodgers. This would be important in the matter of preventing fraudulent registration, etc. No person who is not of good character should be permitted to own or maintain a lodging-house, and bonds should be required of and licenses issued to those who desire to carry on this business. In my judgment, based on many years’ experience, the lodging-house business should be under the immediate supervision of the police, since they are the officials who practically enforce the laws, and because they have better opportunities than any others for ascertaining the character of persons and places.

THOMAS BYRNES.

CAN THE MOSQUITO BE EXTERMINATED?

BY HENRY C. M'COOK, M. D.

NATURAL SCIENCE has taught the world modesty in its judgments. Many things thought impossible have been done, and the imaginary achievements of the genii and magicians of earlier ages are the work-a-day deeds of modern times. Therefore one may well hesitate to say that the extermination of the mosquito is impossible; yet the facts seem to point that way. The mosquito is an ancient inhabitant of this globe of ours, being found among the fossil insects, and is as catholic in its distribution as venerable in its descent. Having thus far held a place among the myriad creatures of our globe, it is likely to continue its generation. Let us, then, accept it as inevitable that the mosquito cannot be exterminated.

Can the mosquito pest be mitigated? That is quite another question, which has just been raised by a philanthropic gentleman with strong scientific tastes. Dr. Lamborn, who has recently offered a prize for a preliminary study of the habits of dragon-flies, with a view to their propagation as destroyers of mosquitoes, has found the ready ear of the American nation. His manifesto was a "touch of nature" which has proved our New World "kin," for, alas! there are few portions of this beautiful domain where the mosquito has not piped her war-song and drawn blood from human victims. I am constrained by truth, despite the seeming discourtesy, to say "her." It is the female mosquito that does all the damage! Her spouse is a harmless creature. Without claiming any knowledge as a specialist of these very interesting but disagreeable insects, I may offer a few suggestions intended to encourage public sympathy and coöperation with an enterprise which may seem to many chimerical. Certainly nothing is ever done by attempting nothing; and if

we wish to rid ourselves of what is an undoubted pest in certain localities, we must at least "make an effort." Success in limiting the number of mosquitoes pivots upon two points: Hostile Environment and Natural Enemies.

I.

Where the conditions are favorable for propagation and growth, the mosquito, like other creatures, will flourish. If those conditions can be made unfavorable, the insect must decrease. This compels us to ask, What are favorable conditions for the mosquito's development?

The question is easier asked than accurately answered. In point of fact, the mosquito has a cosmopolitan distribution. It is supposed to have its paradise in tropical countries, but it flourishes in Labrador. It affects low-lying positions, but lovers of the Adirondack Mountains will recall visions of "smudges," and cheese-cloth canopies on rustic banks, and battles with swarms of culicidæ amid the souging of pines and the sweet fragrance of the balsam. It loves the interior, and many a veteran may recall the days when he hunted prairie-chickens on the plains of Illinois with mosquito-netting twisted around his hat and face; yet it is said, though good testimony could be drawn to the contrary, that "a few" mosquitoes have habitat along the seashore of New Jersey! But wherever found, one condition seems to be essential to its active development. It must have water.

The mother mosquito deposits her eggs in minute boat-like masses upon the surface of water. From these eggs come little larvæ, or worms, or maggots, to use popular words. These wee things inhabit the water, living most of the time at or near the bottom, where they are said to feed upon decaying matter and the micro-organisms that swarm in such conditions. The question has often been asked me, "What were mosquitoes made for, anyhow?" If those who have specially studied the habits of the insects are correct, they certainly render important and useful service during their larval stage by cleansing swamp lands and stagnant pools from the miasms which plague mankind with various forms of fever. Let this much be said to the credit of this dreadfully maligned insect, for it behooves the naturalist, at least, to give "even the devil his due." If our mosquito were only

pleased to confine its existence to this stage, there would be no need to write this paper, for it would be numbered among the benefactors of our race, or, perhaps, like many another benefactor, be utterly unknown.

The mosquito's brief period of larval life is divided between feeding upon the aforesaid micro-organisms, etc., and occasional excursions to the surface for a breath of air. Unfortunately, the larva soon becomes a pupa with a greatly enlarged thorax, which gives the body a club-shaped appearance. Two broad paddles or caudal swimming leaves are fixed at the apex of the body, by which the mosquitoes can wiggle their way through the water. They are active in their habits, but they do not eat. Perhaps their larval diet of miasms proves too much for them. Soon they awake at the call of Nature to another element and another sphere of activity.

It may shock the æsthetic sensibilities of the general public to speak of anything beautiful or fairy-like in the natural history of the mosquito; but really such terms are truly applicable when the mosquito pupa begins to transform. Let me briefly describe the process as entomologists have observed it. These little fish-like larvæ have spent their first stage of being swimming about in stagnant water, devouring the living atoms that swarm therein. They reach their second stage by casting off the larval skin and becoming pupæ. In this stage they remain rolled up like a ball, and float at the surface of the water for the purpose of breathing through the two respiratory tubes on the top of their backs. If disturbed by any unwonted agitation of the water, they suddenly uncurl their bodies and whirl over and over from side to side. This turn-veroin existence, spent with no sustaining nutriment but atmospheric air, terminates in the course of a few days.

Now the little water-tumblers are ready for another transformation. The skin splits on the back between the breathing-tubes, and a little boat is thus formed, as gracefully curved at the bow and poop as the imperial barge of Cleopatra. Out of this fairy bark there suddenly issues a winged creature. The head, the body, the limbs, burst from the opening in the hard skin. The slender legs are raised on the edges of the empty bark until, spreading its wings and pluming itself for flight into sunlight and air, the insect rises, while by the reflex of its upward bound its tiny bark is overset and sinks beneath the wave. If the poet

or artist were to catch this vision at the moment the insect leaves its abandoned bark and stretches its wings for flight, he might well imagine that he had obtained a glimpse of the good old days when one might see "old Proteus" or young Venus "rising from the sea." Alas, that Professor Gradgrind, the naturalist, should be compelled to tell him that he had only seen a mosquito transforming!

This is the natural history of the animal's environment. The practical question is, How can one so control these conditions as to limit the multiplication of the insects? Obviously the answer is, Limit their natural breeding-grounds! When swamps are dried up, when stagnant pools are filled up, when brackish lakes and sluggish streams are drained and dredged and graded so as to give free current to their waters, when the swamp grasses, weeds, sedges, and various plants in which mosquitoes find refuge after transformation are cut down and cleared away,—when, in short, the scythe, lawn-mower, grubbing-axe, and gardener's hand of diligence, thrift, cleanliness, and care have turned our country into a cultivated garden, the days of the mosquito as a pest will be numbered. *Culex pipiens* and all the other species of culicidæ (the family of mosquitoes and gnats) will still have their representatives in the land; but they will be shorn of their power to deplete the veins of summer cottagers and guests and the purses of summer landlords.

II.

The second factor in limiting the number of mosquitoes is that of natural enemies. Of these only two may be mentioned—the dragon-fly and the spider. It is a strange illustration of human perversity that these two animals, whose lives are spent in serving man, should be largely under the ban of human prejudice. The dragon-fly is dreaded; the spider is hated; and yet they are nature's checks upon the mosquito and other insects that otherwise would make our earth well-nigh uninhabitable.

Is it practicable so to develop the dragon-fly and spider that their special gifts from Nature can be further used in the service of man by directing them especially against the mosquito? The first step in the practical consideration of such a question, of course, is that human prejudice should be set aside and these two animals recognized in their true relations to the insect world.

Dr. Lamborn's circular concerning the propagation of the dragon-fly, which has evoked this inquiry, will doubtless call forth a great deal of valuable information from entomologists better equipped for treating the subject than myself. But a few words on this point may not be out of place. "What is a dragon-fly ?" asked an intelligent city gentleman who had read Dr. Lamborn's note. I attempted to explain, and, indeed, took the pains to show him a figure of the insect. "Oh !" was the exclamation, "that's a devil's darning-needle !" Yes ; and the name is expressive of the attitude of English-speaking people towards this serviceable insect. I have read of a school—if memory serves me truly, it was situate in that highly-developed centre of American civilization, New York City—whose session was broken up by the advent of an innocent dragon-fly through an open window. An alarm raised by one scholar passed through the entire room : "A devil's darning-needle ! A devil's darning-needle !" The ominous phrase, piped in the shrill quaver of terrified childhood, alarmed the teacher, and the agitation became so general that the school had to be dismissed as an act of humanity.

Again, I well remember, when a small boy upon the hill of eastern Ohio, gazing with open-eyed wonder upon the beautiful forms of these insects as they flitted to and fro, and heard my older companions speak of them as "snake-feeders." "Look out ! There's a snake somewhere near ! Here's a snake-feeder !" I do not even now know the origin of that term, or the meaning attached to it by people generally ; but to my child's imagination there came up a picture of these strange insects haunting some shady nook by running streams, where, under the shelter of limestone rocks, the serpent reared his head and thrust out his quivering tongue to receive his daily supplies of food from his servant, the "snake-feeder." Is it strange if boyish fancy somehow associated the incident with all sorts of demoniac folk-lore and ghost-stories ? And yet, within two weeks from the date of this writing, a well-informed gentleman who did not know this insect by the name of dragon-fly recognized it at once when I spoke of it as a "snake-feeder." With a keener sense of the beautiful, the French have called this insect *demoiselle*. But for the most part English terminology expresses superstitious fear or ignorance.

There is, however, another popular name which shows that the kindly service of these beautiful neuroptera, the libellulidæ,

is known and appreciated. It is "the mosquito-hawk." Those who have watched the dragon-fly's habits must have noticed that, as it flits here and there, it is engaged in seizing and devouring various insects. In regions infested by mosquitoes, those creatures contribute largely to the dragon-fly's appetite. This deadly war, waged in its perfect estate upon the perfect form of mosquito, is only a continuation of the habit of larval life. Like the mosquito, the mother dragon-fly oviposits in the water, and its young are reared under similar conditions. The dragon-fly larva is as voracious as the imago, and destroys enormous numbers of the aquatic larvæ of other insects, including, of course, the larvæ and pupæ of mosquitoes. Thus it comes about that in both stages of their development dragon-flies are the natural enemies of the mosquito in both stages of its life.

Now emerges the query, Can this "mosquito-hawk" be propagated in such numbers, in regions most frequented by the mosquito, as materially to contribute to the mitigation of the pest? The question is one that can only be answered by experiment, and certainly the interests involved to both human property and human comfort are sufficient to justify the undertaking. There appears to be no difficulty in rearing the aquatic larvæ and pupæ of dragon-flies in artificial conditions. An ordinary aquarium, a good-sized jar, or a glass tumbler will suffice for a successful experiment. The matter which needs most to be attended to in such primitive undertakings is to separate the more ferocious forms from the less.

Dr. Lamborn's offer of a prize for a paper upon the methods of propagating dragon-flies is intended simply as a preliminary step. If the inquiry should develop facts that seem sufficient to justify further experiments and researches, no doubt there will be money enough forthcoming to enter upon this larger undertaking. In the meantime let us encourage the endeavor. It can certainly do no harm. It will, beyond doubt, develop many interesting facts in natural history; and if it shall fail to reach its objective point, it will at least have enlightened the nation somewhat as to the real character of one of the most beautiful and serviceable inhabitants of our insect world.

I now come to another natural enemy of the mosquito, concerning whose habits I can speak with something more of authority. The spider is Nature's chief check against the undue in-

crease of insects. Despised *Arachna* is entitled by her services to occupy the chief place among invertebrate philanthropists. It is, I might almost say, absolutely harmless to mankind. With the exception of an occasional alleged "spider bite" issuing in suffering or death, and delivered by the traditional and indefinite "black spider," I know of no evil that can be charged against the spider. True, as, long ago, the wise Proverbialist said, "She taketh hold with hands, and is in king's palaces." She builds her cobwebs in our homes, but there is no harm in that. If one will take the pains to study the cobwebs, they will be found beautiful structures; and, at all events, the housewife can brush them away without encouraging hatred for the harmless creature that makes them. For, be it considered, the spider only comes into our homes because mosquitoes and other insects also come ! She comes, not seeking to harm us, but to help us, and therefore for the sake of her motive, if she be not welcome, let her, at least, be thought of kindly.

The number of insects of all sorts and sizes destroyed by spiders simply passes calculation. If one will walk out on a dewy morning, with his eyes open for spider-webs, he will be surprised to find how many there are, and how various, too, the forms of spinning-work that meet him. All over this new-ploughed field he will find them ; in yonder meadow, also, hanging by myriads upon myriads on the grasses. Along that hedgerow they are nested and have woven their dainty snares. In the branches of these shrubs and on the foliage of yonder trees are other hosts. If one will push back the foliage, he will see yet others, spiders of the wandering group, that stalk their prey as do the wild beasts of the forests, crouching on trunk and branches and lurking among the leaves. If one turns to the earth, other myriads are seen whose homes are on the ground, or who build slight webs close to the surface. These have laid the axe at the very root of the tree, and are destroying the insects ere they rise from the surface to visit our homes. All these unnumbered multitudes of spiders are engaged during every moment of their existence in waging relentless war upon the insect world. When one considers how many spiders there are, and that they all thus feed upon their natural food, the insects, he may form some just conception of how needful they are to mankind. I do not hesitate to say that, unless Nature should provide some equivalent in

the way of check upon insects, man could not dwell in many inhabited parts of the world were it not for the friendly service of spiders.

But do the spiders have a special taste for mosquitoes? it may be asked. They take what comes to them, and when mosquitoes are abundant mosquitoes are taken. I have counted in an orb-weaver's snare, spun upon the railing of the long bridge over Deal Lake, New Jersey, thirty-eight mosquitoes at one time hanging entangled upon the viscid spirals. Times without number have I seen like destruction wrought to mosquitoes by spiders' webs; for it is a fact that, even after the aranead has satisfied its appetite, its snare continues to capture insects. On one occasion I took the pains to count the number of insects of various species upon one large web which was spread in a favorable position, and found that there were two hundred and thirty-six. It is a most common thing to observe three, four, or half a dozen flies or other insects trussed up upon the viscid orb of some of our orb-weaving species. It is needless to add the conclusion from the above facts: if people would decrease the number of mosquitoes, let them encourage the multiplication of spiders.

The writer of this paper has not aimed to enter learnedly or exhaustively upon the subject, but simply to give a few hints by way of indicating the lines along which we may successfully consider the question, Can the mosquito be exterminated?

HENRY C. McCook.

MINISTERS' WIVES.

BY MARION HARLAND.

IN NO profession—politics not excepted—do personal address and individual popularity avail for more than in that of the clergyman. The most distinguished itinerant who ever bore orders recorded a statement to this effect that sounds like a sigh of resignation to the inevitable. “His letters, say they,”—quoting his critics,—“are weighty and strong, but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech of no account.” From this and other hints dropped, as of their own weight, in these same letters—notably references to partisans of his colleagues, Apollos and Cephas—we may infer that Paul’s preaching in Corinthian pulpits did not “draw,” and that—a thing stranger yet ! although he was either a bachelor or widower (probably the latter)—he was not “popular as a pastor.”

Returning to our first assertion, we may join to it a second as dogmatic. In no other profession, vocation, or craft, do a man’s domestic relations so seriously affect his success. The physician may be a thrice-wedded widower in quest of a fourth twin-soul, or a *divorcé*, or an exemplary Benedict, and not gain or lose a patient as the result of any of these conditions. The lawyer’s private life lies entirely without the walls of office and court-room. Merchant and manufacturer command custom according to the excellence of their wares and their cleverness in putting them on the market. That Xantippe is a pestilent scold does not mar the force of Professor Socrates’s lectures ; Crispin may beat his “woman” daily, yet warrant a perfect fit ; homely, unlettered Rachel Jackson could not keep her husband out of the Presidential chair, nor fascinating Frances Cleveland keep hers in it.

Paul, frankly acknowledging that his oratory was deficient in the suction-principle, and using zealously his compensatory epistolary talent, lets us into other interesting matters of personal life

and opinion. He stickles stoutly for his right to "lead about a wife (who 'is a believer') even as the rest of the Apostles, and as Cephas." This is but one of the lawful privileges cited in his Socratic appeal to the Corinthians, who were, apparently, "difficult" parishioners. In conclusion, he reminds them in sudden calm, as of abrupt recollection of what checks haste and heat: "Nevertheless, we did not use this right; but we bear all things, that we may cause no hindrance to the Gospel of Christ." Perhaps he did not mean to include among possible hindrances the exercise of the right to lead about a pious wife. The unlearned and common-sensible reader will doubtless differ on this point from the erudite (and wedded) commentator. If he did not allude to it, he might have done so with pertinence and with power.

Which leads directly to a third dogma, seriously considered and solemnly expressed. A clergyman's wife can, and (Heaven help him and her!) she often does, mar his usefulness, even to utter destruction thereof, but it is not given to her ever to rivet his hold upon the affections of his charge; to place or to maintain him in a desirable position. She has fatal influence in pulling him from his high estate. Let her be saint, seraph, or *diplomate*, she cannot sustain him there, when the wind of churchly favors veers. It may be the will of Providence, as interpreted by session, vestry, or consistory, that the unbelieving (translated freely "obnoxious") wife may lose a church to the believing (popular) husband. The reversal of positions has no appreciable effect upon Providence or people.

This is especially deplorable, since Our Minister's partner is so often selected for the qualities that would make her "a good pastor's wife." That the theologian must be mated, and the sooner the better, is a postulate. The attempt to work it out as a problem would threaten a *reductio ad absurdum* to him who weighs the power for undoing vested in the other party to the indissoluble contract.

Seriousness deepens into sadness with increase of observation and experience. A "call" to the ministry of reconciliation as God meant the work to be, is the most sublime commission ever put into the hand of man. The leaning toward—the aptitude for—even what competent judges pronounce to be a "vocation" for the clerical profession, as warped and varnished by human agency—is a caricature at which we could more easily weep than

laugh. The man of God no longer directs the battle as a general surrounded by his staff. He fights on foot in the *mêlée*, and as often meets his death from a traitor's hand as from a face-to-face foe. Long pastorates are in disfavor. Our warrior sleeps on the field, one ear open for alarm or for marching orders. His armor should be light and his *impedimenta* few. A wife and children are *impedimenta*.

Dismissing metaphor, let us recall how often the divine of learning, experience, and piety knows himself to be barely tolerated by a church incapable of appreciating him; yet, in consideration of the salary, grudgingly but promptly paid which yields a support for his family, he dare not resign. A rich vulgarian, an officer in the church presided over by such a man, described the situation aptly: "The people have the whip-hand when the pastor is a married man. However high-strung he may be, he thinks twice before he upsets the wagon that carries his wife and babies." "Send us a young man without incumbrance," writes the frontier church that needs a master-builder, and cannot afford to pay for him.

Wise widower of Tarsus! "That we may cause *no hindrance* to the Gospel of Christ."

The duties of the preacher who is also a pastor demand his best powers, and all of them. The service he renders in the pulpit is but a modicum of that exacted and given. If not a success socially, he is a success nowhere. Pastoral visitation is not now a solemn progress of the parish with catechism for children and spiritual converse for their elders. All that has gone out with the rod of the tithing-man and the "awful circle" of church discipline. The people catechise and judge and admonish their spiritual head in this our day. Our popular pastor is a man skilled in small-talk and courtly or jolly "ways"; wondrous in tact and adaptation of manner and language to shades of intellect and breeding; a man of many sides, not one of which is his very own. Should he choose a wife of and for himself, there is a moral certainty that at least one marriage will be a failure in all eyes except, perhaps, his. To fit a woman of mortal mould to the needs and fancies of a parish is a task beyond archangelic ability.

We see women attempt it every day, it is true. The idea that a clergyman, being a model man, must make a model husband;

the devout tendency of the feminine nature; the fact that men of the cloth are usually refined, well-educated, and well-mannered, are considerations that supply the market with minister's wives, until a confirmed clerical celibate is almost as rare as an incorrigibly disconsolate and reverend widower. The success of the Guild with the fair sex is too patent to be argued here.

Thus far there is no cause for cavil. Paul settled the *right* of the question for our generation, as for his. If our Clericus could seclude his hearth-stone angel from parish eyes and parish work, seeking in the home she makes for him the balm and cheer our physician and lawyer find in private life, she might be a helpmeet for him in the best sense of the obsolete term. But from the moment he installs her as mistress of the manse, the complexion of his public life is changed. It is not only disappointed spinsters and managing mammas who look at him with different eyes. His status is entirely altered. His gentle partner may be a timid shadow stealing at his heels. It is a shadow that affects form and perspective. The shepherd ceases to be interesting by virtue of circumstance. He must stand or fall according to talent and behavior. An admixture of patronage creeps into the manner and talk of the senior members of his charge. With the juniors, the same feeling verges upon contempt. "Art thou, then, become one of us?" is the half-sneering thought.

The new wife must reinstate him. If she be quick-witted and discreet, she tries to do it by making herself one with "the people," suing for their suffrages (always for love's sake and *his*) by every winning art she can command. Independent women, disdainful of subterfuge, girding at unjust exactions, defy impertinent criticism, hold on their own way, and suffer—with their husbands—the consequences of self-will.

There is, strictly speaking, no propriety in expecting the woman who has espoused a clergyman to have, *ex officio*, special fitness for all departments of charitable and religious labor. Common-sense rules that she may suit him excellently well as a wife, yet be endowed with no peculiar gifts for "leading meetings" and "taking chairs." Yet, by an anomalous incongruity, inseparable from the situation, the next worst thing to absolute insignificance in her case is decided significance. To outshine or outwork her lord is to demonstrate his insufficiency to fill the high and responsible office to which he was elected. If she be a cipher, she de-

tracts from his worth. He cannot, after the manner of other public men, bold in the knowledge that their houses are their castles, cast himself between her and her censors with the protest, "A poor thing, but *mine own!*" I have known men thus "hindered" to drag the shrinking weaklings into the fore-front of the battle, prick them into action beyond their strength by frantic appeals to expediency, custom, pride, love, piety, until the victims of a false system, wounded and wearied to their death, fell under the harness so much too heavy for them. The gaps they leave are quickly filled, often by stouter stuff. If I dared relate the humble tragedies of this kind which have come under my eye, the rush of recruits into the places of the fallen martyrs might be less eager.

Hardly less to be pitied is she intended by nature to be a leader among women, who marries the man of her choice with the earnest purpose of playing her part gallantly as his true yoke-fellow and lieutenant. I once heard the monition addressed to a wife of this build by a not unkindly mother in Israel, that covered the point neatly.

"You preside *too* well," said the mentor. "You manage too skilfully and are too ready of speech, too quick to put people at their ease with bright, pretty sayings and all that, you know. Of course, we understand that you mean well and only try to do your duty as a minister's wife; but you put plain, everyday folks at a disadvantage, and even ordinary folks don't like *that*, you see!"

The minister's wife is, in too many parishes, virtually included in the engagement which hires him, body and soul. The unwritten contract is unfair, cruel, and iniquitous. What a private church-member of equal ability and opportunity can do consistently with her duty to her husband and family, standing in her lot in the fear of the Lord and love of her kind, she is bound to undertake—and *nothing more*. What she may or may not accomplish should affect her husband's influence in the same field no more than if he were a lay communicant in the church to which she belongs. The rule which makes the popularity won by her virtues and winsomeness ineffectual to succor him in the hour of need should work both ways, or not at all.

As it is, the mournful conviction that he for whom she would sacrifice ease, comfort, and life itself, would, after all, have done

better for himself and the Master had he never married her, has broken many a loving heart and brave spirit.

I need no mother or father in Israel to warn me that I am touching upon delicate and dangerous ground. If, to my apprehension, it may appear that the modern Nehemiah would work more efficiently and hold out longer to wield the sword in one hand and the trowel in the other, if he were not distracted by the wife's clutch upon his skirt and hampered by the baby bound upon his shoulders, I do not forget that wiser heads than mine have declared and do maintain the celibacy of the clergy to be a pernicious doctrine.

Let me, also, guard myself from invidious personalities by grateful mention of exceptional parishes where the love and loyalty rendered the pastor envelop his home and the dwellers therein in an atmosphere of affectionate appreciation, which is at once sweet and wholesome, invigoration and balm. Labor with such a "people" is a continual joy, and companionship with those who compose it enriches with fuller meaning the phrase "the household of faith."

These churches are not "run upon business principles"—a term much in vogue and favor of late years. The fundamental principle of business being to pay for what you bargain for, and to demand nothing more, excludes the unsalaried and uncontracted-for services of the minister's wife. By so much as she exceeds in zealous good works the layman's consort, she lays an obligation of affection and gratitude upon church and parish.

This is what men on the street call "cold business." It may be, as our postulate declares, that he who, in the mystical language of Holy Writ, is "put in trust with the Gospel," most needs, of all life-warriors, the tender ministry which only a true wife can bestow. Admitting it in the name of common humanity, then, in the name of heavenly pity, let her belong to him—him alone!

MARION HARLAND.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

FRIENDS IN SOUTH AMERICA.

It is NOT expected that any immediate or direct result will follow the meeting of the International American Congress in October. The most ardent advocate of this plan of bringing our neighbors together never even hoped to see them fall upon one another's necks with *embracios* and vows of eternal peace and affection; nor did the most sanguine market-hunter ever suppose that the delegates from Central and South America would carry home with them our surplus products. We may not sell another yard of prints or another paper of needles during the winter, but this meeting will mark an epoch in the commercial history of this hemisphere; and nowadays, at the present stage of human progress, commerce is the inspiring idea of nations, as conquest was not long ago. The purpose of England in India and Africa was not to gratify a lust for power, nor to evangelize the heathen, but her sacrifice of millions of lives and billions of treasure was an investment to secure a market for the sheetings of Manchester and the hardware of Birmingham.

The results of the conference will be largely sentimental. One of the chiefest motives that inspired its promoters was good-fellowship, neighborly interest, and a desire for a better acquaintance. The ignorance of the people of this country regarding the Latin-American people is simply amazing. It was not long ago that a member of a President's Cabinet in a public speech in the city of New York referred to Buenos Ayres as the capital of Brazil, and a Justice of the United States Supreme Court once asked me what language was spoken in Chili. Most of the geographies studied by the children in our schools refer to the Argentine Republic as a confederation, regardless of the fact that a war was fought some years ago to convince certain provinces that it is not one; and the graphic and illustrated descriptions of the wild horses roaming ownerless over the pampas, which delighted the sense of the picturesque three generations ago, still remain on the pages they have always adorned, although it would be quite as appropriate and truthful to apply them to Iowa or to Illinois. The Englishmen who want to run over to New York for a little buffalo-shooting are no more absurd in their ignorance than the writers of some of our standard geographies; and our friends and neighbors in South America know very little more about us than we know about them, for very good reasons.

The habit of visiting Europe is quite as general among people of means in South America as among the citizens of the United States; and I am told that the number of South Americans at the Paris Exposition is even greater in proportion to population than those who have gone from the United States. It is conceded that the most extensive and tasteful exhibit of American products at the Exposition is furnished by the Argentine Republic. The ladies of South America go to Paris for their gowns and their bonnets, and send their sons and daughters to the universities of England and the Continent to be educated. But very few of them have ever been here.

Why? Because they have no means of transportation. With twenty-one lines of steamships connecting Buenos Ayres with Europe, offering luxurious accommodations and low rates of fare, it is not strange that they seldom come to a country with which they have no direct communication whatever, or that their tradesmen buy of our merchants only such goods as they cannot obtain elsewhere. And, un-

fortunately, the greater portion of our citizens who have made South America an abiding-place have not been such as to inspire the people of that continent with a high regard for the character, or an admiration for the conduct and culture, of the North American. The lack of extradition treaties has tempted certain types of our population to seek asylums south of the Caribbean Sea, and at the expense of our national reputation.

That the leading men of the Latin-American races may see us as we are, that they may study and report upon our national institutions, and the extent of our material development, of which the best-informed of them has but a meagre conception, this conference has been called; and from this observation and contact its greatest good may come. Before proceeding to the formal consideration of certain topics of international interest, they will be asked to inspect the results of our national industry as the guests of the government and the people. It is not possible or practicable to take them everywhere, but in a hotel on wheels they will be hurried from one city to another in such a way as to afford them an adequate idea of our resources, our mechanical and agricultural industries, our social and political conditions, our educational and commercial progress, our facilities for trade and transportation, and the sources of our wealth, power, and prosperity. The purpose is to make the journey of profit to the people of the United States as well as to their guests, who will include from fifty to sixty of the most distinguished citizens of Central and South America. It is quite as desirable that these gentlemen and the ladies who accompany them should receive social attentions as information concerning the industries of the country; that they should see the homes as well as the factories and farms of our people, our educational and charitable institutions as well as our mills and mines, our systems of State and municipal government, and every feature of our political, social, religious, and commercial life. Each passenger upon the excursion train will be a missionary, and should be impressed with object-lessons.

They come from countries where European continental customs have been inherited and still adhere to domestic and mercantile life, and the ancient prejudices and restrictions of Spain yet exist to a great degree. The equality and freedom of the sexes, the schools for the higher education of women, the dignity of labor, as recognized and encouraged in the United States, will afford them fascinating subjects of study, and will enlarge their moral as well as their mental horizon.

All this is quite as important as the consideration of questions concerning commercial intercourse, which will claim their attention afterward, and of the effect of a free and familiar discussion there can be no doubt. Agitation is always beneficial. Our commerce with Central and South America is reviving, and this fact is due to a stimulated interest. The commission which visited the other continent in 1884-85, and upon whose recommendation the approaching conference is called, brought back much valuable information, which has been given to the people through its reports to Congress, and in the pages of our newspapers and magazines. More has been written and published in the United States concerning the countries south of us during the last four years than in a quarter of a century previous, and the results of this stimulated interest are shown in heavier mails, in the tables of commercial statistics, in the increased passenger traffic upon the few lines of steamships that stagger under burdensome disadvantages, but manage to maintain infrequent communication, and in the recent organization by the merchants of New York city of a commercial association for the expansion of our trade in Spanish America. Our merchants are sending drummers into the southern continent, our manufacturers are studying the requirements of its markets and endeavoring to comply with them, and the members of our Congress have commenced to discuss, if they have not enacted, laws that will relieve the restrictions of trade.

All this has come from agitation. It is the result of diverting the public attention in a direction to which it had not been turned for many years before. Tourists are beginning to visit Central and South America, where they have never gone before, and each returning traveller brings back intelligence that tempts others to follow in his footsteps. The coming conference will greatly increase this new-born interest

and extend the agitation, and the proposed exposition to commemorate the discovery of Columbus will be a great international educator.

The October conference is simply a deliberative body. Its functions are confined to discussions and recommendations, and its results will require legislation and diplomacy to become permanently effective. Upon our Congress rests the great responsibility. Our merchants must have the same facilities that their foreign competitors enjoy to meet them upon an equal footing. It cannot be expected that the people of Latin America will furnish us opportunities that are furnished them by European capital and enterprise. They have already sufficient lines of communication with markets upon the other side of the Atlantic, where their wants are now supplied. They lack nothing in the way of commercial advantages. They have profitable markets for their products, and adequate means of reaching them, which have been established by their customers. They are not seeking our trade, but we are seeking theirs, and to secure it we must employ the same methods that other nations have used.

WILLIAM ELEROY CURTIS.

II.

WHAT MAKES THE ACTOR?

THIS apparently simple question has been put by the writer to many eminent actors and actresses without in any instance eliciting a satisfactory answer. In some cases a more explicit question has been asked, but even when put in this extended form, "What are the qualities of mind and temperament that make the actor?" the replies have been indefinite. Many people whose names are in the front rank of the dramatic profession have clearly stated their inability to give any answer at all. It seems singular that the followers of an art should be unable to point out the necessary foundations for success in their calling, or to explain on what grounds their own popularity rests. Refuge has been taken in the remark that the actor, like the poet, "is born, not made"; but this is an evasion, not a solution. However much the poet may owe to his birth, the intellectual and temperamental gifts that go to the making of poetry are capable of reasonably clear definition. Where the actor differs from the followers of any of the other arts is in the fact that his personal appearance and manner enter largely into his work, and to a considerable extent determine its acceptability. His figure, face, and voice constitute the instrument on which he plays, but, no matter how attractive this may be, the player must possess, in order to be great, the informing ability to draw out the necessary harmonies and make all humanity vibrate in sympathy with them.

Mr. Boucicault, who has probably given as much thought as any living man to all that concerns the stage, said: "The actor's art is purely mimetic. I remember a famous old actor saying to me when looking at a performance: 'Monkeys, my boy; we are all monkeys!' Intellect has not necessarily much to do with acting. I don't think I ever met a man of more moderate intellectual development than the elder Farren, who was famous in *Sir Peter Teazle*, *Grandfather Whitehead*, etc., etc. Well, when I was going to produce 'London Assurance,' he didn't think there was much in the character of *Sir Harcourt Courtly*. I took him for a walk in Hyde Park and showed him two old beaux. 'Now,' I said, 'I have built *Sir Harcourt* out of materials in those two men. Study them; get them down fine.' He did, and the result was a performance that ranked with the best. Left to himself, Farren would not have evolved anything effective. His talent was entirely mimetic."

But when Mr. Boucicault was asked, "How about the expression of emotions which lie outside the limits of the actor's observations or experiences?" his answer was: "The actor then draws upon his imagination, and mimics or reproduces what he believes to be true." This is an extension of the field of mimicry which might be made to cover a vast amount of ground in many arts. It seems to be purely arbitrary, and not entirely logical. When one of Mr. Boucicault's ability is forced into such apparent paradoxes to explain or defend his theory, it only serves to show the extreme difficulty of forming any theory whatever.

Lawrence Barrett's answer was terse, consisting of these three words: "Sensibility and imagination." Undoubtedly these are requisites, but by no means all that is needed. Sensibility is an admirable quality in an actor, if properly held in check; but too much sensibility will mar the effect of a performance. The actor who yields unreservedly to his own tears or emotions becomes indistinct and inartistical. There are hundreds of people who fancy they would make good actors because their feelings are easily roused. Many young actors and actresses really suffer with the characters they represent, but this does not necessarily make their work appear true to audiences. There is a vast difference between suffering one's self and causing an audience to believe one is suffering. One is nature; the other art; and nature is not usually effective upon the stage. What the French call "the optic of the theatre" makes nature appear distorted and out of perspective and true coloring. For this reason a real tree upon the stage would be to all appearances less real than a painted one. Nature's greens are not vivid before the footlights, but the artist so heightens them that in relation to other things they are made to look brilliant, but yet natural. So it is with acting; the appearance, not the reality, is wanted. Even when the spectator most loses thought of his surroundings in seeing a play, he is still conscious that it is all acting. If he did not have this consciousness, he could not, unless he were an inhuman brute, find pleasure in witnessing the depiction of suffering. And this consciousness of unreality, so necessary to the spectator, is of still greater importance to the actor. In Mr. Archer's recently-published book, "Masks and Faces," the author has been at pains to gather the statements of famous actors as to how much they feel with their characters. The great bulk of the testimony shows that, when emotion is unreservedly yielded to, the performance is ineffective.

A large class of actors and writers about the stage claim that good acting is simply the result of thought and skilful technique. We have lately had in New York one or more distinguished actors of this school, but much as their talents have been admired, the one touch of true feeling that makes the efforts of less finished artists reach the heart has been felt to be wanting. Acting that emanates from the brain only will never rouse the majority of theatre-goers. A highly-cultivated intellect is by no means necessary to theatrical success. Any one who has a large acquaintance with actors will confirm the truth of this statement. Indeed, it is questionable if high intellect and much culture do not as a rule destroy that mobility and plasticity of temperament and bearing which are a part of the tools of a great actor.

"Magnetism" is a word which has of late come into general use to describe the qualities of sympathetic actors. Its employment does not, however, define anything. The grouping of powers under this head makes their origin no more easy to understand than is that of the mysterious force whose name has been given to them. Beauty of face, figure, and voice do not make up magnetism. Several of the most beautiful women on the stage are utter "sticks." Many who are plain to an almost painful degree can play at will on the feelings of their audiences.

An eminent teacher of elocution said: "Acting is the proper conveying of the thoughts of the author. This must be done by speaking his words correctly. Elocution is everything in acting." Such a dogma is contrary to the opinions and experiences of nearly all actors, who believe that what is *done* upon the stage is far more important than what is *said*. Any one who saw "Jim the Penman" will remember that in the crucial moment of the play, when *Mrs. Ralston* discovered that her husband was a forger, not a word was said. Yet, for about two minutes, *Mrs. Booth* held the spectators breathless by her silent acting. It is possible, perhaps even probable, that in poetic plays and certain tragedies the words may be more important than the action; but this is assuredly not true of the great majority of dramatic representations. *Mme. Modjeska*, in an interview printed last year, pointed out very clearly the difference between the poetic and the emotional play. She said, in effect, that the poetic play depended upon thought and diction, while the emotional play depended upon action; and she stated that, though she ventured to act *Camille*, this was her only attempt at emotional drama, and that she considered herself purely a poetic actress.

The writer is not rash enough to attempt to define the constituent properties of an art when its own most distinguished followers confess their inability to do so. Possibly, however, this statement of difficulties and diverse opinions may incite thought, and induce some one to grasp and explain the elusive qualities and gifts necessary to the success of the actor.

JULIAN MAGNUS.

III.

IF!

A NEWSPAPER writer, speaking of the late Thomas J. Potter, who, as general manager of the Union Pacific Railway, received an annual salary of \$40,000, says that he began his career twenty-five years ago as a lineman on an Iowa railway at \$45 per month. "He worked his way up," it is added, from the latter position to the former, "and there is not a young man on any railroad in the United States for whom the same result is not possible, if he should put into his work the same amount of brains and zeal which Mr. Potter did." How inspiring! What a trumpet-call to young railway employees to become, one and all, presidents of great lines, and the recipients of yearly salaries each one of which is in itself a fortune! "If he should put into his work," etc. No doubt; and "if my aunt had been a man, she would have been my uncle." It is just and only that provoking "if," reader, that prevents a beggar from becoming a Rothschild, or you and me from rivalling Webster at the bar, Gladstone in the senate, or Scott and Dickens in fiction. "If" is a very small word,—a monosyllable of two letters only,—yet how immense is that "If"! Thousands of persons who now languish in obscurity would astonish the world, were they not, like Mirabeau in his youth, confined in the castle of If.

"If I but had an opening," sighs many a young man in these days of overcrowded professions and multiplying competitors for office and place, "the world should see what I can do." "If I but had an opening!"—as if the very seal and sign of ability—the essential difference between it, or genius, and dilettantism—were not a regal superiority to the "openings" and "opportunities" which so many aspirants to wealth or honor make a condition of success. The successful man is the one who *made* a way when he could not find one; who made the adverse circumstances, over which others were moaning, the ministers and aids to his advancement, instead of becoming their slave. The difficulties which disheartened them only stiffened his sinews; the block of granite which was an obstacle in their pathway became a stepping-stone in his. A lad of twelve years of age, who already played the piano very skilfully, once said to Mozart: "Herr Kapellmeister, I should very much like to compose something. How am I to begin?" "Pho, pho," said Mozart, "you must wait." "But you," said the boy, "composed much earlier." "Yes," replied Mozart, "but *I asked nothing about it*. If one has the spirit of a composer, *one writes because he cannot help it*." On another occasion, writing in reply to a friend who had asked about his way of composing music, he names certain occasions when his ideas flow best and most abundantly, and adds: "*Whence and how they come I know not, nor can I force them*. . . . Why productions take from my hand that particular form and style which makes them *Mozartish*, and different from the works of other composers, is probably owing to the same cause which renders my nose so and so, large or aquiline, or, in short, makes it Mozart's and different from those of other people, for I really *do not study to aim at any originality*."

The letters of Dickens show that it was in a similar way that he wrote those wondrous novels of his that enchant the world. When a new creation was about to rise from the ocean-depths of thought, he did not go about asking advice, or gird up his literary energies by a prodigious effort of the will, but, to use his own language about "The Chimes," "all his affections and passions got twined and knotted upon it"; he went wandering about at night into the strangest places, "possessed," spirit-driven, a prophet commissioned to utter the life-giving word to men's souls, and finding no rest until he uttered it. So, though rarely perhaps in the same degree, with the eminent men, the great leaders, in almost every calling; they chose

their respective pursuits, if they can be said to have chosen them, not because those pursuits promised the most money, fame, or happiness, but unconsciously, because they could not help it; and they succeeded, not because they resolved with an intense, continuous act of volition to do such and such things, but because they were impelled by a great, prevailing, paramount desire, which engulfed all lesser desires, to do them. No doubt there is a will that makes the man; but if it is not inborn, it cannot be put into him, and it needs no prompting. To tell a young man that he can become a millionaire, a railroad king, etc., etc., "*if* he will put into his work the same amount of brains and zeal" as A or B did before *he* became a millionaire or railroad king, is the veriest drivel. It is equivalent to saying that he will become a Samson if he will only put forth a Samson's strength, or that if an astronomical student will put into his work the mental energy, the spiritual force, of Newton, he will do as great things as Newton—which is not a very stimulating statement, if it be true. How strangely men persist in regarding moral qualities as habits merely, and not gifts! The will is a natural endowment as well as the mental faculties, and to want it is as bad as to want mental power.

WILLIAM MATHEWS.

IV.

THE SLAYER OF J. WILKES BOOTH.

THE WRITER had a personal acquaintance with Boston Corbett, who avenged the death of President Lincoln in so tragic a manner on the night of April 26, 1865.

During the year 1875, while attending a Soldiers' Reunion of Blue and Gray, at Caldwell, Ohio, I first met Mr. Corbett. The town was small and an immense crowd had gathered, General Sherman, among others, being present. Corbett and I were assigned to the same room for the night. I found him a nervous, excitable man, always the centre of attraction, with a keen, but wild, look in his eyes, and an interminable restlessness of body and limb. He was then a preacher, regularly ordained, I think. He led a prayer-meeting in the village church while there. He was always well armed, in self-defence, as he explained, and his experience while at Caldwell showed that he had some reason to fear violence. He got into an exciting argument with several men one afternoon over the question as to whether Booth had really been killed at all. Hot words ensued, a rush was made towards Corbett, and in an instant the gleaming barrel of his revolver flashed in the faces of his opponents. It was with considerable difficulty that they were separated and peace restored.

Corbett claimed to those of us whom he considered his friends that he had been hounded for years by men who were high in authority at Washington at the time of the assassination, and that they caused him to lose several important positions after he went into civil life, and had refused to shake hands with him or to answer his salutation on the streets. The only reason he assigned for this was that his bullet had deprived the Washington authorities of an opportunity to make a grand display in the execution of Booth.

Be this as it may, it is certain that Corbett was always on the watch for bodily harm from some source. During the night I shared a bed with him this was exemplified. It was a close, hot night. We slept on the ground floor, with the window raised. Corbett walked the floor for ten minutes after I was in bed. He would frequently clasp his hands and exclaim: "The Lord have mercy on my soul!" At last he knelt down and offered a fervent prayer, after which he placed a large revolver under his pillow and went to bed. He then told me the whole history of that dark night in Virginia. He said no words could express the resigned hatred, and yet heroic look, of Booth's face as it was lighted up by the flames of the tobacco barn, in which he had taken refuge from his pursuers. To the call for surrender, Booth hurled back words of scorn and defiance, and turned his back on the troops in derision. Corbett said he could stand it no longer, and, although the orders were to take Booth alive, if possible, he raised his revolver and fired. The wound in Booth's head was said to have been within half an inch of the location of Lincoln's fatal wound.

Corbett went to sleep, and I followed later on, with a restless, troubled sleep, in which I dreamed of something which made me awaken Corbett. He sat up in bed, drew out his pistol, and covered me with it. I assured him it was all a dream, and he calmed down again. For several years afterwards I received occasional letters from Mr. Corbett, and he finally drifted to Kansas, where, through the aid of some friends, he was appointed doorkeeper of the House of Representatives during the winter of 1887. While there his mind became seriously affected, and he suddenly appeared in the House one morning with a revolver in each hand, and attempted to kill the Speaker and others. He was promptly removed to the insane asylum.

Early in the year 1887, and while he was in the State House at Topeka, I sent a note to Corbett, asking him to write me an account of the capture and death of Booth, which he did. A copy of his reply is given herewith. I have every reason to think Mr. Corbett's memory was in fair condition when he wrote the article, and it may safely be accepted as a correct narration of the incidents of a dark hour in the nation's history.

R. B. HOOVER.

In camp, at Vienna, Virginia, on the morning of April 15, 1865, the news reached us that President Lincoln had been shot the night before; later news said he was alive, but there was no hope of his recovery. Our regiment (the 6th New York Cavalry) was immediately ordered out in pursuit of the assassin. Deployed as skirmishers, we advanced down to the Potomac River. When near the river, we saw the flag at half-mast on one of the forts, and we knew our President was dead. We returned to camp unsuccessful, but were soon afterward sent to Washington, to go in any direction required to scout for Booth.

Our regiment was soon cut up into detachments, all engaged in the same work, under different leaders, Colonel N. B. Switzer commanding the main body of the men; Major Bosworth, another portion of our command; another party under command of First Lieutenant Ed. P. Doherty, with twenty-six enlisted men, also accompanied by two detectives, to aid in the capture. They had photographs of Booth, Herold, and Surratt.

At the Sixth-Street wharf, we took the steam-tug John S. Ide, under Captain Henry Wilson, who conveyed us to Belle Plain, where we landed and at once began the search between the two rivers, Potomac and Rappahannock. At Port Conway the ferryman recognized two of the pictures and said: "These two men crossed my ferry yesterday. Willie, J. H., a confederate officer," he said, "aided them on their way, giving Booth a lift on his horse after crossing the river." We followed the clew given, captured J. H., who was compelled to guide us to the place where he had left the men. Arriving at Garrett's farm, the Lieutenant said to me: "Booth is in that house; ride through the command, and see that every man's pistol is in readiness for use." I did so, and supplied two of our men with caps for their revolvers, who were out of caps.

On entering the premises, we found the men were no longer in the house, but had taken refuge in the barn. A surrender was demanded and refused, Booth declaring that he would not be taken alive. After much parleying Herold concluded to surrender, and was at once put under guard. The tobacco barn was then fired by Conger (the detective), and Booth could then be seen. A single shot from a Colt's revolver brought him down, and the capture was effected. A doctor was sent for, who pronounced the wound fatal. Inside of three hours he was dead. Mr. Conger chose me as an escort, and we started for Belle Plain, and he there took steamer for Washington, and before evening closed the news had flashed over the wires that Booth was taken.

April 26, 1865, was the day when God avenged Abraham Lincoln's death.

Our captive was deposited on the monitor Montauk, at the Navy-Yard at Washington.

During the interval of our different scouts, I attended prayer-meeting one night at Wesley Chapel. The leader said: "Brother Corbett, lead us in prayer." I prayed:

"O Lord, lay not innocent blood to our charge ; but bring the guilty speedily to punishment." Afterward, when the assassin lay at my feet, a wounded man, and I saw the bullet had taken effect about an inch back of the ear, and I remembered that Mr. Lincoln was wounded about that part of the head, I said: "What a God we serve! I little thought, when I offered that prayer a week ago, that it would be answered in this way."

BOSTON CORBETT,

Late Serg't Co. L, 16th N. Y. Cavalry.

Written at Topeka, Kansas, January 19, 1887.

V.

AN EMERGENCY THAT DEMANDS A WORD.

I FIND MYSELF in hearty accord with the writer who recently suggested in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW that there should be an American Academy of Language established for the purpose of determining that the growth of the English language in America shall proceed along scientific lines and with a scientific basis. The language is bound to grow. As

"New occasions teach new duties,"

so new objects, new ideas, new inventions, demand new words. Shall these things be left to whim, or chance, or the happy-go-lucky choosing of an inventor who has no true conception of the way in which words ought to be formed or selected? It would seem that there are enough monstrosities in the language already, and that the time has come for more rational action in the future. The establishing of an Academy of Language, in which all the colleges and higher educational institutions, and all the learned societies, should have representatives, would undoubtedly be a wise and conservative movement. Its authority would speedily vindicate itself. In all probability the newspapers, which are mainly instrumental in giving currency to words, would gladly accept the decisions of this tribunal and consent to employ in their columns no words that had not received the stamp of official approval.

I am led to these reflections by the necessity which has arisen for some word to express the process by which a convict will be killed when he is executed by the new law in New York State, which provides for the use of electricity as a substitute for the hangman's noose. The word "execution," by a process of restriction which is common in language, has come to mean simply hanging. Strictly speaking, of course, it is the law which is executed, not the man, and there are some purists who still insist that this is the only proper use of the word. So under the new method we shall still speak of execution when the murderer is—*what*? That is the question. Here, if the Academy of Language were in existence, would be a splendid opportunity for it to rise to the occasion and meet this—not long-felt, but—pressing want. Various "words" have been invented by various newspaper writers to fit the present case, but none of them seems to "fill the bill" exactly. Of all the suggestions, the palm for barbarism that is absolutely soul-harrowing must be assigned to "electrocution," with its companions in misery, "electrocute" and "electrocuted." May some good angel intervene and save the English-American language from such a blight! This emergency ought to arouse our people generally to the need that undeniably exists for some unquestioned authority which might be looked to in cases of this sort for a decision at once wise, rational, and common-sensible. Whether the proposed method of "execution" is a success or not, there will be not a little gained if the want of a word to designate the operation should lead to the establishment of such an institution as the writer referred to in my opening sentence would like to see established. At all events, I am very glad to second his motion with great heartiness, and with a profound and growing conviction that the need of prudent and sagacious direction of the growth and development of a language is imperative.

KINGDON MEREDITH.